National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Service des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CHILD'S REPORT OF PARENT BEHAVIOUR INVENTORY - ETHNIC DIFFERENCES

BY

JOE RACZ (C)

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

IN

COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Spring, 1990

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-60139-6

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Jozsef J. Racz

TITLE OF THESIS: Child's Report of Parent Behaviour Inventory - Ethnic Differences

DEGREE: Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1990

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis or extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Jozsef Racz
(Student's signature)

EDMONTON

9737- 93 ST.

(Permanent address)

Dated Apr. 24, 1990

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Child's Report of Parent Behaviour Inventory - Ethnic Differences" submitted by Jozsef J. Racz in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in Counselling Psychology.

Peter Calder.

Dr. P. Calder

E. E. Fox

Dr. E.E. Fox

Charles Hobart

Dr. C.W. Hobart

Date: April 23, 1990

ABSTRACT

Four hundred seventy-seven Edmonton high school students attending Career and Life Management and English as a Second Language classes completed: (a) a demographic questionnaire; (b) a questionnaire designed to obtain information on selected individual and family characteristics; and (c) the Child's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory - Revised, or CRPBI-R (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970a). The objectives of the study were to determine if the CRPBI-R maintained its factor structure with a multi-ethnic sample, and to assess the relationships between perceived parent behavior and ethnicity, residency in Canada, and selected individual and demographic variables. On the basis of responses to the questionnaire, students were grouped into: (a) five geographic blocs (West, Asia, Latin America, Europe, and Middle East); and (b) three levels of residency in Canada (zero thru five years, six or more years, and born in Canada). A series of factor analyses revealed that the CRPBI-R maintained its factor structure in this sample. Analyses of variance revealed that significant differences between geographic blocs were primarily due to higher perceived parental Psychological Control and Acceptance CRPBI-R factor scores for Middle East and Asia blocs as

compared with West bloc students. Analyses of variance revealed that significant differences between residency in Canada groups was primarily due to higher perceived parental Psychological Control for students residing less than five years in Canada as compared to students born in Canada. Analysis of variance and Pearson correlations revealed relationships between a number of individual and demographic variables and CRPBI-R scale scores, particularly age, education of father, and perceived academic ability of student. Results were discussed in terms of cross-cultural childrearing practices and intergenerational conflict as related to immigration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. P. Calder for his help and patience with this project. I would also like to thank Dr. E.E. Fox and Dr. C.W. Hobart for participating as committee members.

My affection and thanks go to my parents, who taught me to be proud of our adopted country as well as our home country.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
Chapter I		
	Introduction	1
	The Present Study	3
Chapter II		
	Review of the Literature	9
	Theoretical Foundations of the CRPBI	9
	Development and structure of the CRPBI	13
	Cross-cultural Research on Parent-Adolescent Relations	24
Chapter III		
	Methodology	41
	Sample	41
	Method	43
	Instruments	44
	Analysis of Data	48
Chapter IV		
	Results	52
	Research Question One	52
	Research Question Two	57
	Research Question Three	65
	Research Question Four	70
Chapter V		
	Summary and Implications	76
	Discussion	78
References		93
Appendices		103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	Means and Standard Deviations of CRPBI-R Factors for Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) High School Data	20
2	Means and Standard Deviations of CRPBI-R Factors for Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) University Data	21
3	Sample Sizes by Culture, Location, Sex, Age (Young and Old) for Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) Study	34
4	Reliability Analysis of Scale Item Contents on CRPBI-R Scales (N = 420)	54
5	Varimax Rotated Matrix of CRPBI-R Scale Loadings on Factors	56
6	Mean CRPBI-R Scale Scores by Geographic Bloc. (N = 455)	58
7	CRPBI-R Scale Score F Values for Geographic Bloc by Sex Analysis of Variance (N = 452)	60
8	Multiple Comparisons By Geographic Blocs for Table 7 Analysis of Variance	61
9	CRPBI-R Factor Score F Values for Geographic Bloc by Sex Analysis of Variance (N = 464)	63
10	CRPBI-R Factor Score F Values for Country Analysis of Variance (N = 434, df = 10,423)	65

11	CRPBI-R Scale Score F Values for Years in Canada and Father's Education Analysis of Variance (N = 444)	67
12	Multiple Comparisons By Years in Canada for Table 11 Analysis of Variance	68
13	CRPBI-R Factor Score F Values for Years in Canada and Father's Education Analysis of Variance (N = 455)	70
14	Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between CRPBI-R Scales and Demographic Variables (N = 477)	72

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Since the beginning of 1983, over 65,000 new immigrants have arrived in Alberta (Alberta Career Development and Employment, 1989). The number of persons entering Canada has varied over the past decade from a low of 84,331 in 1985 to 152,000 in 1987, approximately 24,000 to 35,000 of these people are children or youth, and approximately 25-35% of this group are between 15 and 19 years of age (Canadian Task Force on Mental Health Issues Affecting Immigrants and Refugees in Canada, 1988).

These statistics reflect the increasing importance of the study of ethnic differences in Canadian society, as its texture and composition becomes increasingly multicultural in nature. Since the overwhelming majority of immigrants to Alberta come as families, many with adolescent children, it can be seen that relations between immigrant parents and adolescents is an important area of study.

The study of these differences in family relations among ethnic groups is within the field of cross-cultural psychology, which Triandis (1980) called: "the systematic study of behavior and experience as it occurs in different cultures, is

influenced by culture, or results in changes in existing cultures" (p. 1). Researchers in cross-cultural psychology such as Ho (1987), McGoldrick, Pearce, and Giordano (1982), and Nann (1982) have focused on the study of ethnic differences in family relations.

Immigrant families represent not only an opportunity to study ethnic differences in parent-adolescent relations, but also an opportunity to study these relations under stressful conditions, in that the changes in life inherent in the immigration process place unique stressors on the family. Many reviewers have taken note of the stressors upon the children of immigrants, and particularly of the high incidence of conflict between parents and children in this group (Rosenthal, 1984; Salvendy, 1983; Stein, 1982; Aronowitz, 1982). Aronowitz (1982) in his review of the literature on the social and emotional adjustment of immigrant children noted that research pointed to a characterization of adolescence among immigrants as a time of acute identity crisis and intense conflict with parents. The Canadian Task Force on Mental Health Issues Affecting Immigrants and Refugees in Canada commented that "...intergenerational conflicts related to adaptation are well documented by the literature on migrant family relations" (p. 11).

Despite the well documented high incidence of intergenerational conflict within immigrant families, there is a paucity of research in the psychological literature even within the broader theme of parent-adolescent relations in different cultures. This is a noticeable deficit, particularly when set beside the large amount of research devoted to the comparatively more narrow theme of parent-adolescent conflict within the North American culture, as can be seen in extensive reviews such as that of Montemayor (1983), most recently.

The Present Study

Schaefer's (1965a) Child's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory, or CRPBI has been used extensively to study parent-adolescent relations in North America. It has stood the test of time well, and is still used extensively. Reliability, validity, and norming data are well-established. The CRPBI has been applied to the study of adolescent-parent relations in the context of: self-esteem (Kawash, 1985), genetics (Rowe, 1981), pubertal status (Steinberg, 1987), and even post-Holocaust traumatization (Last, 1985). Numerous factor analyses by other researchers have validated Schaefer's original three factors, most recently Kawash

(1988), Schwarz, Barton-Henry, and Pruzinsky (1985), and Graybill and Gaybel (1978).

Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) Questionnaire for Teen-Agers and Young Adults has proven to be a frequently-used revision of the CRPBI. The authors made efforts to adapt their questionnaire to cross-cultural studies by eliminating items inappropriate to ethnic, social or religious minority groups. There are references in the literature to its application to other ethnic groups, such as Rohner and Pattingill (1985), Barnes (1982), and Schludermann and Schludermann's (1971, 1983) own cross-cultural work. All of these studies found Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) revision of the CRPBI to be a useful instrument for the detection of cultural differences.

Instruments which meet the requirements of studies such as the present one are infrequent in the research literature - that is, instruments which both assess family relations variables and those for which efforts have been made at cross-cultural validation. It would seem important therefore to apply the CRPBI to the study of a range of cultural and ethnic groups in the Edmonton area. The population of local high schools represents a diversity of cultures, many representatives of which are first or second-generation

immigrants. Schludermann's (1970a) revision of the CRPBI is an effort to devise a well-grounded instrument that can be used to compare and contrast different cultural groups.

The purpose of the present study is therefore to examine aspects of parent-adolescent relations as measured by the CRPBI, and compare these relations between different ethnic and cultural adolescent groups. In addition, the present study is an attempt to compare parent-adolescent relations between adolescent groups varying in socioeconomic status, academic performance, sex, and length of time in Canada to determine what effects these variables have on parent-child relations for different ethnic groups.

Both Schaefer's original (1965a) CRPBI scale and Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) revision of the CRPBI will be mentioned frequently in this study. Therefore, the following abbreviations will be employed to distinguish between the two scales: The original scale will be termed "CRPBI", while the Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a) revision will be termed "CRPBI-R".

Objectives and Research Questions of This Study

The objectives, along with the research questions asked in this study, are as follows:

1. To determine the effectiveness of the Child's Reports of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI) in studying cross-cultural differences in perceived parent-adolescent relations among a diverse ethnic sample.

Is the integrity of the factor structure of the CRPBI-R, as reported in Schludermann and Schludermann (1970b), maintained for the sample of this study?

2. To determine the extent and direction of cross-cultural differences in the way that adolescents perceive their relations with their parents.

Are there significant differences with the CRPBI-R between students of different ethnic groups?

3. To study the relationship between number of years in Canada and perception of parent-adolescent relations.

Are there significant differences in perception of parent-adolescent relations as measured by the CRPBI-R between students who are recent immigrants and students who have lived in Canada for more than five years?

4. To study the relationship between ethnicity, perception of parent-adolescent relations, and

demographic variables such as sex and socioeconomic status.

Are there significant differences with the CRPBI-R between students of different sexes, socioeconomic levels, ages, and scholastic abilities?

Practical and Theoretical Implications

The present study could have the following theoretical and practical implications:

1. Findings may help officials within the school system determine the nature of parent-adolescent relations perceived by their students, and consequently provide more information related to demands upon the students at home, realistic goal setting, and information of benefit to parent-teacher liaison.

2. Results may alert researchers to the need for increased cross-cultural norming and validation of instruments used to assess aspects of family relations and dynamics, particularly as our society continues to evolve in an increasingly multicultural direction.

3. Results may indicate ethnic differences in parent-adolescent relations to guidance counsellors working in the school system, of significance as the counselling process becomes increasingly cross-cultural with the rising influx of immigrant students to area schools.

4. As cross-cultural studies involving the CRPBI and other family relations instruments are rare in the literature, the results of the present study may serve to further determine the utility of the CRPBI as a measure of perceived parent-adolescent relations.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

In order to address the research questions posed in the previous chapter, the development and structure of the CRPBI in the context of parent-adolescent relations theory will be reviewed, followed by a discussion of the cross-cultural research in the area of parent-adolescent relations theory. The relevant literature will be discussed under the following headings: (a) Theoretical foundations of the CRPBI, (b) Development and structure of the CRPBI, and (c) Cross-cultural research on parent-adolescent relations.

Theoretical Foundations of the CRPBI

Martin (1975) extensively reviewed the literature on parent-child relations from a social learning theory perspective and placed the study of reports of parental behavior within this broader context. He characterized the study of parent-child relations as the study of the domain of parent behaviors, the domain of child behaviors, and the relation between parent and child behaviors. Within the domain of parent behaviors, Martin took note of two major dimensions of parent behavior first conceptualized in the 1930s: acceptance-rejection and dominance-submission. Martin

considered them to be "dimensions which have stood the test of time rather well" (p. 465). Martin cited extensive research showing the relationships between these dimensions of parent behavior and the behavior of offspring, including dependence, aggression, and withdrawal.

The majority of the research which has produced the theoretical underpinnings of the domain of parent behavior has been a product of studies which have used children's reports of parental behaviors, and a great deal of the theory in this area in turn has been contributed by E.S. Schaefer.

Schaefer (1959) studied existing data in which mothers were rated on 18 child interaction behaviors and arranged these behaviors diagramatically in a systematic circular order. The vertical and horizontal axes of this circle of behaviors consisted of the two already well-established dimensions of acceptance-rejection and dominance-submission. In this so-called Circumplex Model, correlations between maternal behavior variables adjacent to one another in the circle were high, becoming progressively smaller the farther apart the variables lay on this continuum.

Schaefer's later studies (Schaefer, 1965b) lead him to consider a three factor solution to parent-child relations, resulting in the Circumplex model becoming a

spherical, three dimensional one, with a third relationship dimension axis lying at 90 degrees to the first two. Schaefer gave the following names to these three factors: Acceptance versus Rejection, Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy, and Firm Control versus Lax Control.

Goldin (1969) extensively reviewed the published literature on children's reports of parental behavior research. He noted the similarities between Schaefer's (1965b) factor analysis-based conceptualizations and those of another contemporary, Siegelman (1965). In his review Goldin (1969) analyzed research dating from as far back as 1931 and classified the literature in terms of a combined Schaefer-Siegelman three factor model. He found that fully half of all the parent-child relations studies he could find in the literature focused on one or more of Schaefer (1965b) and Siegelman's (1965) three factors. In commenting on the significance of the two theorists' conceptualizations, Goldin (1969) noted: "...their considerable strength as organizing constructs derives from their convergence with each other and their consistency with earlier studies of children's reports of parent behaviors" (p. 223).

The Influence of Demographic Variables

There are a number of demographic variables that have consistently been found to effect parent-child and parent-adolescent relations. Studies attempting to find meaningful results in this area must attempt to take them into account as much as possible.

Martin (1975) discussed the effects of sex of the child, sex of the parent, ordinal position of the child, and social class of parents on parent-child relations. Goldin (1969) reviewed findings on the effects of demographic variables on Schaefer (1965b) and Siegelman's (1965) three factors. In the context of Schaefer's (1965b) three factor dimensions, Goldin's findings are summarized below for the more important of these demographic variables:

1. Sex of Parents. Children perceive mothers as more Accepting and fathers as exercising more Firm Control. Both fathers and mothers are perceived as exercising equal Psychological Control.

2. Sex of Children. Boys perceive parents as exercising more Psychological Control and Firm Control, but as less Accepting, than do girls.

3. Age Effects. Preschoolers report fathers versus mothers as exercising greater Firm Control and Psychological Control. During middle childhood, the same sex parent is perceived as exercising greater Firm

Control and Psychological Control, while during adolescence, both parents are perceived as playing this role. Children report less Acceptance and greater Rejection in adolescence than in their younger years. Sex of the child interacts with this variable in a complex manner. Research from other sources tends to support Goldin's (1969) findings. Montemayor (1983) in his extensive review of the parent-adolescent conflict literature found that research seemed to support the conclusion that conflict increased during early adolescence, was reasonably stable during middle adolescence, and declined as the adolescent moved away from home.

4. Socioeconomic Status. Children from lower socioeconomic status families perceive parents as less Accepting and, to some extent, as exercising more Psychological Control.

Development and Structure of the CRPBI

E.S. Schaefer (1965a) developed the original CRPBI on the basis of his circumplex model of parent behavior, described above (Schaefer, 1959). Scale items were derived from Schaefer's (1959) factor analysis of psychologists' ratings of parental behavior. The following criteria were used: "High predicted item variability, high predicted item-scale

correlation, and applicability of the item to both maternal and paternal behavior" (Schaefer, 1965b, p. 552). The factor analyses resulted in the emergence of Schaefer's (1959) two primary dimensions, which he called love versus hostility and autonomy versus control. These corresponded to the already well-established dimensions of parent behavior noted previously - acceptance-rejection and dominance-submission (Martin, 1975). The original instrument contained 26 scales descriptive of parental behaviors with ten items for each scale. It also consisted of two separate forms: one to assess children's perceptions of the mother, and one to assess perceptions of the father.

The scale was originally administered to two groups of girls and boys - seventh grade suburban school children, and institutionalized delinquent boys. The breakdown of the suburban sample by age level was provided in Schaefer (1965a): 42 boys and 47 girls at 12 years of age, 40 boys and 32 girls at 13 years of age, and 3 boys and 1 girl at 14 years of age. The delinquent sample ranged in age from 12 to 18 years. Socioeconomic status of the sample was assessed by means of determining the educational level of parents, and appeared to be representative of a broad socioeconomic range.

On the basis of this administration, Schaefer (1965b) determined that the median internal consistency reliability for the 26 scales of the CRPBI was .76, ranging from .38 to .93. Schaefer (1965a) grouped scales that sampled his primary dimensions of love versus hostility and autonomy versus control. He reported median internal consistency reliabilities for these as follows: love, .84; hostility, .78; autonomy, .69; and control, .66. Numerous researchers since Schaefer (1965b) have computed internal consistency reliabilities for the CRPBI, and have found them comparable (Margolies & Weintraub, 1977; Schwarz, Barton-Henry, & Pruzinsky, 1985). Schaefer (1965a) concluded that "...the reported reliabilities are sufficiently high for research on differences between groups and on correlates of these reports" (p. 416).

The only measure of validity that Schaefer (1965a) reported was criterion-related, that is was the CRPBI able to discriminate between criterion groups? Schaefer compared the Z scores for each of the 26 scales between the boys from his sample of suburban school children and Z scores for the delinquent boys. He compared Z scores for each of the two CRPBI forms: reports of mothers and reports of fathers. He found that, for the 52 differences in Z scores that would be possible in this type of comparison (2 forms X 26

scales), 26 differences were significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Schaefer (1965a) considered that the CRPBI displayed considerable discriminative validity, in that the significant scale differences he found between the "normal" schoolboys and the delinquent boys appeared to be consistent and in a predictable direction. Delinquents when compared to normals described both mother and father as being higher in allowing extreme autonomy and lax discipline, and described father as being much less positive and loving. Delinquent boys described mother and father as lower on most parental control scales, with the exception of the Control through Guilt scale where the direction of the difference was reversed.

Schaefer (1965a) reported other discriminative validity findings that pointed to socioeconomic status scale score differences, and suggested that an interaction existed between the variables of sex of child, sex of parent, age of child, social class, and religious affiliation as they related to reports of parental behavior, a conclusion supported by Goldin (1969). Other validational evidence for the CRPBI has come from research which has correlated CRPBI-measured perceptions of parental child rearing with other

measures (e.g., Litovsky & Dusek, 1985), to be discussed later.

The Three-Factor Structure of the CRPBI

The three-factor structure of the CRPBI was first determined by Schaefer (1965b). He submitted the CRPBI to a factor analysis, after administering the scale to seventh grade boys and girls, delinquent boys, and two male adult samples of Army hospital personnel and patients. Since that time, the CRPBI in its original or modified forms has been subjected to numerous factor analyses with varied populations and Schaefer's (1965b) three factors have been consistently found (Armentrout & Burger, 1972; Graybill & Gaybel, 1978; Kawash, 1988; Margolies & Weintraub, 1977; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970b; Schwarz, Barton-Henry, & Pruzinsky, 1985).

Schaefer (1965b) and subsequent researchers denoted these three factor dimensions as Acceptance versus Rejection, Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy, and Firm Control versus Lax Control.

The descriptions of the three factor dimensions which follow are after those of Litovsky and Dusek (1985), and the abbreviations are those which will be used for the balance of this study. High CRPBI scores

on the three factors indicate high reported parental Acceptance, Psychological Control, and Firm Control respectively:

1. Acceptance versus Rejection (A/R). Children's perceptions of parents as being positively evaluating, affectionate, providing emotional support, and being equalitarian in their treatment versus perceptions of parents as being ignoring, neglecting, and rejecting.

2. Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy (PC/PA). Perceptions of parents as using covert, psychological methods of controlling the child and behaviors that do not permit the child to develop individuality versus perceptions of parents as not using guilt, anxiety, or love withdrawal to control behavior.

3. Firm Control versus Lax Control (FC/LC). Perceptions of the degree to which parents make rules and regulations, set limits on the child's behavior, and enforce the rules and limits, versus perceptions of parents as laissez-faire and uninvolved in the child's affairs.

Revisions of the CRPBI

Along with the original CRPBI (Schaefer, 1965a), there are two popular short forms of the instrument. The Armentrout and Burger (1972) revision is the

shortest, and most widely used. It consists of one 16-item scale and five 8-item scales. Margolies and Weintraub (1977) reported test-retest reliabilities over a one-week period as ranging from .55 to .93 for the three factor dimensions. These reliabilities remained relatively stable over a five-week test-retest period.

Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) CRPBI-R is another popular revision of the CRPBI. As described in Schludermann and Schludermann (1970b), the investigators selected 18 scales from the original CRPBI. They used the criteria of high scale reliability, variability, and applicability to parental behavior. They then selected those items from each of these 18 scales that had the highest item reliability. In addition, items which were inappropriate to ethnic, religious, and social minority groups were eliminated to adapt the instrument for cross-cultural research. The CRPBI-R consists of six 8-item scales, and twelve 5-item scales.

Schludermann and Schludermann (1970b) administered the revised instrument to 692 urban Manitoba male and female university undergraduates. Schaefer's (1965b) original three factor dimensions were found to emerge once again in the factor analysis.

Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a) reported on the norming procedures used in their revision. As the CRPBI-R is the revision employed in the present study, these norming procedures will be discussed in more detail. The authors administered the CRPBI-R to two samples: high school students and university undergraduates. The high school sample was drawn from the Winnipeg area, and consisted of 196 boys and 168 girls, with approximately equal representation in three age groups: 13, 15, and 17 years. Schludermann and Schludermann noted no age or sex effects, and consequently pooled this data. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations obtained in this sample for the three factors of the CRPBI-R.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of CRPBI-R Factors for Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) High School Data

	CRPBI-R Factors					
	A/R		PC/PA		FC/LC	
	X	s	X	s	X	s
Father	21.23	3.89	15.38	3.63	20.86	3.42
Mother	21.81	3.54	16.79	3.47	20.70	3.09

Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) university sample was drawn from 3 independent samples of University of Manitoba students. (The first two samples were based on Schludermann and Schludermann's [1970b] data, while the third was drawn at a later date.) The university samples consisted of 667 females and 525 males in all. As analysis of variance revealed an effect for sex, the authors presented male and female data separately. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations of the total university sample for the three factors of the CRPBI-R. The authors reported percentile scores for both the high school and the university samples.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of CRPBI-R Factors for Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) University Data

	CRPBI-R Factors					
	A/R		PC/PA		FC/LC	
	X	s	X	s	X	s
Father						
males	20.11	3.99	15.65	3.74	18.88	3.64
females	21.43	4.43	14.90	3.50	19.38	3.70
Mother						
males	22.07	3.29	16.11	3.74	17.96	3.34
females	22.70	4.04	15.51	3.54	18.98	3.24

Applications of the CRPBI

The CRPBI and its revisions has been applied in a large number of contexts. A good deal of research has been conducted in the area of parent-child relations and child or adolescent self-esteem.

Attempts have been made to relate the FC/LC dimension of the CRPBI to children's self-esteem, [1] and with few exceptions, these attempts have failed. The other two factorial dimensions of the CRPBI have proven to be better predictors of self-esteem. Graybill and Gaybel (1978) found the factor dimensions of high Parental Acceptance and Psychological Autonomy to be predictive of high self-esteem, as did Litovsky and Dusek (1985). Crose (1981) also found that scores on CRPBI scales that load on the Psychological Autonomy end of the PC/PA factor were related to high self-esteem. Kawash (1985) found sex differences in the relationship between self-esteem and CRPBI factor scores. Kawash reported that boys with high self-esteem scores reported both parents as high on the Acceptance end of the A/R factor dimension, while girls with high self-esteem reported parents as high in Psychological Autonomy. Kawash (1985) also found self-esteem differences in the previously elusive FC/LC factor; his high self-esteem boys reported both parents as high in Lax Control. It seems evident from the

above studies that high self-esteem in children and adolescents is related to high perceived parental Psychological Autonomy and, to a lesser extent, high perceived Acceptance.

A number of studies have also focused on age differences in CRPBI factor and scale profiles. In an extensive study, Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) found that younger adolescents (13-15 years old) consistently reported higher parental Firm Control and Psychological Control than did older adolescents (16-18 years old) on the CRPBI-R. Litovsky and Dusek (1985), in the self-esteem study described above, reported that students in grade nine perceived their parents as being less Accepting, as measured by the CRPBI, than did students in Grade eight, who in turn reported their parents as less Accepting than students in Grade seven. They also found that older students with high self-esteem perceived their parents as high in Firm Control to a similar extent as did younger students with low self-esteem. Since higher scores on the Firm Control dimension of the CRPBI reflect a perception of parents as increasingly attempting to regulate the adolescent's life, Litovsky and Dusek postulated that older adolescents tended to view their parents in this light, or perhaps to view even minimal parental rules or guidelines as being overly regulatory.

Cross-Cultural Research on Parent-Adolescent Relations

This cross-cultural section of the review of the literature is divided into three parts as follows: (a) Research on intergenerational conflict, (b) Research by Rohner and his associates with parental acceptance-rejection theory (e.g., Rohner, 1975; Rohner, 1980; Rohner, 1986), and (c) Cross-cultural research with the CRPBI.

Research on Intergenerational Conflict

A large amount of the parent-adolescent conflict literature has focused on themes related to the "generation gap" between the values of adolescents and their parents. In particular, the cross-cultural literature has been concerned with the adjustment problems of immigrants and their families as related to the widening of the generation gap upon exposure to the new culture (Aronowitz, 1983; McGoldrick, 1982; Nann, 1982; Stein, 1982). Studies in this area often have contradictory findings that appear to stem from the pull of two mutually opposed forces on the immigrant adolescent: the need to adapt and "fit in" to the new culture, and the security of long-standing traditions and values as represented by the old culture.

Studies have been conducted attempting to assess the relative importance of these forces, some comparing intergenerational relations between parents and adolescents of relatively Westernized immigrant groups, to those of relatively traditional immigrant groups.

Meijer (1976) studied adolescents ranging in age from 16 to 18 years. He compared those from Ashkenazi (East European) backgrounds to those of more traditional Sefardi (Southern European and Mediterranean) Jewish backgrounds. Meijer conducted an analysis of variance that compared the adolescents' perceptions of their relations with their parents according to ethnic background, religiosity, and parental education. Meijer found that Sefardi religious mothers were perceived as being more supportive and protective than Ashkenazi non-religious mothers, independent of parental education. Meijer interpreted these findings in the Eriksonian context of more well-defined role definition in the traditional Sefardi religious families. This provided more consistent rules and increased security for the Sefardi adolescent.

Magan, Weller, and Klahr (1976), in a similar study conducted in Israel, reported findings that seemed to provide only partial support to those of Meijer (1976). Magan et al. found that, as compared to

Ashkenazi adolescents, comparatively traditional Yemenite (Middle Eastern) Jewish adolescents (a) were more accepting of parental authority, and (b) were more likely to agree with their parent's values. However, the authors also found that Yemenite adolescents (c) identified less with their parents, and (d) felt to a lesser extent that their parents were able to advise them. The authors interpreted their findings by distinguishing between those aspects of intergenerational relations involving identification and modeling from those involving agreement and acceptance of parental authority.

Studies comparing immigrant and non-immigrant groups in the area of intergenerational conflict are more consistent in their findings, as exemplified by Rosenthal (1984). Rosenthal administered a brief questionnaire which highlighted 12 general household conflict themes to one non-immigrant and two immigrant adolescent samples. The immigrant samples consisted of adolescents whose parents were born in Greece or Italy. The non-immigrant sample consisted of adolescents whose parents were born in Australia. Rosenthal found that immigrant adolescents did in fact report significantly greater intergenerational conflict than did non-immigrants. She had attempted to control for demographic variables such as socioeconomic status,

thus providing more strength to an interpretation of results based on conflict between the culture of origin and the adopted culture.

It can be seen that, although findings seem to vary, and are occasionally contradictory in these types of cross-cultural studies, authors consistently report inter-group differences that are attributable to variations in culture and ethnicity.

Research on Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory

Rohner's (1975, 1980, 1986) school of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PART) has contributed a great deal to the cross-cultural theoretical underpinnings of this aspect of parent-child relations. It is important to discuss his work in some detail as it, along with the CRPBI to be discussed later, has been applied with some consistency to the study of cross-cultural differences in parent-child relations.

Rohner (1980) defined PART as follows:

> PART is a theory of socialization which attempts to predict major psychological, environmental, and maintenance systems conditions under which parents the world over are likely to accept or reject their children. (p. 1)

Rohner and his colleagues developed the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire, or "PARQ", to test the tenets of PART theory. The PARQ, in both its adult and child forms, has been used extensively in

cross-cultural research on perception of parent behavior.

PART and personality variables in children.

The primary direction of much of Rohner and his associates' research has been in studying the relationship between personality variables and perceived parental acceptance-rejection during development.

Rohner, Roll, and Rohner (1980) found that Mexican children reported their parents as significantly more rejecting than did American school children. Children who perceived themselves as being rejected reported more emotional and behavioral disturbance. Saavedra (1980) found significant positive correlations between perceived parental warmth (acceptance) and perceived self-esteem and self-adequacy with Puerto Rican adolescents.

Rohner and his associates have also studied the relationship between socioeconomic variables and the personality correlates of PART. Rohner et al. (1980) found that middle class Mexican children perceived their parents as more rejecting and reported their own behavior in more negative terms than did the working class Mexican children. Rohner, Hahn, and Rohner (1980) found that children from middle class Korean-American families perceived their mothers as

being significantly less rejecting than did children from working class Korean-American families. They also found that the children from Korean-American middle class families had more positive feelings of self-esteem and self-adequacy than did children from the Korean-American working class families.

Some of the strongest cross-cultural evidence for the relationship between perceived parental acceptance-rejection and personality variables comes from Rohner and Rohner's (1975, 1980, 1986) holocultural studies. Rohner (1986), citing Naroll, Michik, and Naroll described the holocultural method as a "paradigm of research for testing hypotheses 'by means of correlations found in a worldwide, comparative study whose units of study are entire societies or cultures, and whose sampling universe is either (a) all known cultures ... or (b) all known primitive tribes'" (p. 38). In Rohner (1975), the best known of his holographic samples, two independent raters coded each of the variables of interest in a sample of 101 ethnographies. These variables were primarily societal parental acceptance-rejection, and predetermined personality characteristics. In this manner, interrater reliability being high, correlations could be performed between societal acceptance-rejection and the personality variables of interest.

Rohner's holocultural and cross-cultural studies have all contributed evidence toward the formulation of the central postulate of PART: that the personality characteristics of hostility, dependence, negative self-esteem, negative self-adequacy, emotional instability, emotional unresponsiveness, and negative world view are "expected to appear to a significantly greater extent among rejected children the world over - regardless of culture, physical type, language or other limiting conditions - than among accepted children" (Rohner, 1980, pp. 7-8). Rohner's work also underlines the significance of parent-child relations research in two primary ways: First, it shows that a number of significant, apparently lifelong personality variables are effected by the relations between children and their parents. Second, it shows that these effects appear to be world wide in nature.

PART and research on ethnic differences.

Rohner (1986) reported on ethnic differences with the PARQ, comparing data obtained from a number of cross-cultural studies with the instrument. Using the PARQ, data were reported for a number of linguistic/ethnic groups residing within seven different countries: Canada, Czechoslovakia, India, Korea, Nigeria, Puerto Rico, and the United States. Children in the samples were of both sexes and ranged

in age from 6 through 19 years, with the majority being 9 through 13 years of age. Many levels of socioeconomic status were represented. Rohner found that for most of the represented societies, perceptions of parental behavior tended to cluster close to the acceptance end of the acceptance-rejection continuum. Scores obtained from three countries in his sample were significantly different, and outside this cluster. Mean PARQ scores for two of the Indian and one of the Nigerian sample societies were higher in acceptance, while the mean for the Mexican sample was far closer to the rejection end of the continuum.

Rohner's (1986) data, as well as much of his other work, has shown that there are cultural differences in levels of perceived acceptance-rejection, but that most societies treat their children with high levels of warmth.

Cross-Cultural Research With the CRPBI

There are also references in the cross-cultural literature to research performed with the CRPBI and its various revisions.

The instrument has been subjected to factor analysis with cross-cultural samples. The earliest such application is that of Renson, Schaefer, and Levy (1968) who administered the CRPBI to 182 male and

female Walloon high school students in Belgium. The authors found the three-factor structure of the CRPBI to be replicated for the Belgian sample. Similarly, Schludermann and Schludermann (1971, 1983) found the three-factor structure of the CRPBI-R to be maintained, in their work with Hutterite and East Indian adolescents.

Rohner and his associates have conducted studies within the context of PART to assess the relationship between perceived parental warmth, or acceptance, and perceived parental control. The findings suggest that the existence of such a relationship may be culturally influenced. Schwarz, Barton-Henry, and Pruzinsky (1985) found perceived parental warmth and control as assessed by the CRPBI-R to be independent for a North American sample. For his Puerto Rican adolescent study, Saavedra (1980) found a significant negative relationship ($r = -.32$, $p<.05$) between perceived warmth as assessed by the PARQ and perceived parental control as assessed by the CRPBI. Using the same instruments, Rohner (1985) found results in the opposite direction. Working with Korean adolescents, he found a significant positive relationship ($r = .34$ [mother], $r = .41$ [father], $p<.001$) between perceived warmth and perceived parental control. Rohner speculated that this surprising finding was due to cultural differences

between Korean and American adolescents in terms of lesser emphasis in Korean society on independence, coupled with a greater acknowledgement of parent's right to exert authority.

Research with the CRPBI-R.

Much of Schludermann and Schludermann's early research in developing the CRPBI-R has been with Manitoba's Hutterite communities. Schludermann and Schludermann (1971) found that sex of the respondent and particularly sex of the parent played a role in Hutterite adolescent's perception of their parent's behavior. In contrast with North American norms, Hutterite children perceived no differences between mother and father in the Psychological Control or the Firm Control factorial dimensions. The authors interpreted these findings in the context of communal childrearing practices in Hutterite society.

An exhaustive study of cross-cultural differences using the CRPBI-R was carried out by Schludermann and Schludermann (1983). As the methodology was similar to that of the present study, it will be discussed in some detail.

Schludermann and Schludermann applied the CRPBI-R to the comparison of adolescent's perceptions of parent behavior among three socioculturally distinct societies, one Canadian and two East Indian. A

continuum of cultural and socioeconomic change was represented by the samples. The Canadian sample was drawn from Winnipeg and was termed "Modern" by the authors, in the context of its cultural values and socioeconomic level. One Indian sample came from private high schools that teach a British curriculum in English and was termed "Transitional". The other Indian sample came from public high schools that teach a tradition-oriented curriculum in Hindi, and was termed "Traditional". The Transitional sample displayed similar characteristics to immigrant groups in that it represented a group in conflict between Traditional and Modern values. Sample sizes for the study are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Sample Sizes by Culture, Location, Sex, Age (Young and Old[a]) for Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) Study

Culture	Location	Sex		Age		Totals
		Male	Female	Young	Old	
Canadian	Winnipeg	196	168	299	65	364
Traditional	Old Delhi	214	341	313	242	455
Traditional	Old Lucknow	177	294	274	197	471
Transitional	New Delhi	148	216	203	161	364
Transitional	New Lucknow	152	157	133	176	309

[a]"Young" adolescents in the study were the following ages: Winnipeg, 13-15 yrs.; Old and New Delhi, 13-15 yrs.; Old and New Lucknow, 13-15 yrs. "Old" adolescents were the following ages, by location: Winnipeg, 17 yrs.; Old and New Delhi, 16-18 yrs.; Old and New Lucknow, 16-18 yrs.

The Indian adolescent sample was drawn from two separate North Indian locations, the cities of Delhi and Lucknow. Each location contained approximately equal representations of Traditional and Transitional adolescents. The authors conducted a series of analyses of variance that compared the sample by culture, sex of respondent, sex of parent, and age group.

The hypotheses that Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) sought to test, and the results upon completion of their study, will be presented in point form in the context of the three factor dimensions of the CRPBI-R:

1. Acceptance/Rejection.

Hypotheses: (a) Indian adolescents would report higher Acceptance than Canadian adolescents, (b) Adolescents would report higher Acceptance for mothers as compared with fathers, (c) Girls would perceive higher Acceptance than boys, and (d) Younger adolescents would report more Acceptance than older adolescents.

Results: Hypotheses (a), (b), and (d) were unconfirmed. Main effects for A/R tended to be weak. Hypothesis (c) Partially confirmed. Girls across all cultures reported greater paternal Acceptance than did boys.

2. Firm Control/Lax Control.

Hypotheses: (a) Traditional Indian adolescents would report higher levels of Firm Control than Transitional Indian adolescents, (b) Girls would report higher levels of parental Firm Control than boys for their mothers, (c) Boys would report higher levels of parental Firm Control than girls for their fathers, and (d) Younger adolescents would report higher levels of parental Firm Control than older adolescents.

Results: Hypothesis (a) was confirmed. Modern Canadian adolescents reported higher levels of Firm Control than did Traditional Indian adolescents, who reported higher Firm Control than Transitional Indians. Hypotheses (b) and (c) were unconfirmed. Sex differences were either insignificant or inconsistent. Hypothesis (d) was confirmed. Strong age differences were found. Younger adolescents of all cultures consistently reported higher levels of Firm Control than did older adolescents.

3. Psychological Control/Psychological Autonomy.

Hypotheses: (a) Traditional Indian adolescents would have the highest level of Psychological Control, while Canadian (Modern) adolescents would have the lowest, (b) Adolescents would report higher levels of Psychological Control by the same-sex parent, and (c)

Younger adolescents would report higher levels of Psychological Control than older adolescents.

Results: Hypothesis (a) was confirmed. Traditional adolescents had the highest levels of Psychological Control, Transitional adolescents had medium levels, and Modern adolescents had the lowest levels. Hypothesis (b) was unconfirmed. Sex differences were once again insignificant. Hypothesis (c) was confirmed. Younger adolescents of all cultures consistently reported higher levels of Psychological Control than did older adolescents.

Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) then sought to compare the effects found for socioeconomic status and culture by two methods. First, they pooled the data from their two Indian samples, and classified their groups by culture and socioeconomic level. They then performed a series of *t* tests comparing these groups. Second, they matched Traditional and Transitional Indian groups for socioeconomic level and conducted analyses of variance.

The authors found that, although these manipulations attentuated the effects for culture, culture differences still accounted for a far larger proportion of the variance of their sample than did socioeconomic level.

In summary, Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) found that the CRPBI-R's factor structure was highly replicable across cultures, and that it was a sensitive instrument for detecting cultural differences in perception of parental behavior. They found significant differences for two out of the three CRPBI-R factors - Firm Control and Psychological Control - between all three cultural groups and between SES levels. Cultural differences were on the whole larger than SES differences, and cultural effects persisted among the East Indian subjects even after groups were matched for SES scores. The authors concluded that, as exemplified by the child-rearing patterns of the Transitional Indian group, culture change may lead to readjustments of family interaction patterns and socialization practices.

It can be seen from this review of the literature that the CRPBI-R holds promise as an instrument for detecting cultural and ethnic differences in the perception of parent-adolescent relations, and as an instrument for dealing with the research questions addressed in Chapter I. Following is a summary of the findings in the literature as they impact on these research questions:

1. There is evidence in the literature that the factor structure of the CRPBI-R is maintained in

cross-cultural samples (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1971, 1983). To what extent is it maintained in a multi-ethnic sample such as that of the present study?

2. There is evidence in the literature of cross-cultural variation in the way that adolescents perceive their parents (Rohner, 1985; Rohner, 1986; Rohner, Roll, & Rohner, 1980; Saavedra, 1980; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1983). Are there significant differences with the CRPBI-R between students of different ethnic groups?

3. The stressors on the children of immigrants have been well documented in the literature (Aronowitz, 1983; McGoldrick, 1982; Nann, 1982; Stein, 1982), and there is evidence that immigrant adolescents react to these stressors (Magan, Weller, & Klahr, 1976; Meijer, 1976), particularly as compared with non-immigrants (Rosenthal, 1984). As measured by the CRPBI-R, are there differences in perception of parent-adolescent relations between adolescents who have lived in Canada for different lengths of time?

4. There is also considerable evidence in the literature of the influence of a number of demographic variables on parent-adolescent relations (Goldin, 1969; Litovsky and Dusek, 1985; Martin, 1975; Schaefer, 1965a; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1983). Are there significant differences with the CRPBI-R between

students of different sexes, socioeconomic levels, ages, and scholastic abilities?

Footnotes

[1]CRPBI-R Factors: FC/LC: Firm Control versus Lax Control; PC/PA: Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy; FC/LC: Firm Control versus Lax Control. Refer to page 18 for description of CRPBI-R factors.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

To answer the research questions outlined in Chapter I, a questionnaire was assembled consisting of the CRPBI-R, a series of demographic questions, and a series of questions designed to elicit information on variables effecting perception of parent-adolescent relations. Arrangements were made through the Research Coordinators of the Edmonton Public and Catholic School systems to administer the questionnaires.

Sample

The research sample consisted of 477 Grade 11 students drawn from three urban Edmonton high schools: St. Joseph's Composite High School from the Edmonton Catholic School system, Queen Elizabeth and J. Percy Page Composite High Schools from the Edmonton Public School system. All three schools serve a wide socioeconomic range of students and were selected, in cooperation with the Catholic and Public School Boards, on the basis of serving a high immigrant population. There were 243 males and 232 females in the sample. Ninety-seven of the respondents in the sample were not born in Canada and had resided in Canada five years or less. One hundred thirty-four respondents had resided

in Canada six years or more. Two hundred thirteen respondents had been born in Canada.

Questionnaires were administered to all students in attendance at two types of classes on the days of administration: (a) Career and Life Management (CALM) classes at the Grade 11 level; and (b) English as a Second Language (ESL) classes at Level 2 or Level 3. School administration selected CALM classes as appropriate venues because the subject matter corresponded with aspects of the CALM curriculum. To ensure representation in the sample of students who were new to Canada, school administration complied with a request for ESL class venues. In cooperation with personnel at the schools, Level 2 and Level 3 ESL classes were selected to participate in the study as a control for reading ability. Questionnaires were administered to all Grade 11 CALM and ESL classes held during the days of administration.

The majority of students ranged in age from 15 to 18 years, with 27 students aged 19 years and over. The majority of the older students were newcomers to Canada, with 22 of them having resided in Canada for less than five years.

Method

Data were collected during regular class periods, and the questionnaire was administered in group format. All questionnaire administrations for two of the schools were conducted by the author and took place over a four day period. For the third school, at the request of the school administration, questionnaires were administered by the ESL and CALM teachers to their own classes. Instructions for administration were provided to a liaison person at the third school.

After being introduced to the class by the teacher, the examiner distributed copies of the questionnaire to the class, along with optical scoring sheets and pencils with which to mark their responses. The examiner requested that students not commence writing until the instructions had been completed. After an introduction to the purpose and subject matter of the research, and a description of the procedures that would be used in assuring confidentiality of responses, the examiner gave instructions for Part One of the questionnaire. Students were requested not to complete Part One on their own, but to wait until the examiner had finished giving the instructions for each section. The purpose of this request was to provide

greater control for incorrect student responses due to not following the written directions to Part One.

After all students had completed Part One in this manner, instructions were given for Part Two of the questionnaire. After all students had completed Part Two, they were given the instructions for Part Three of the questionnaire. As this portion of the questionnaire contained the CRPBI-R, students were requested to answer the questions on their own, without assistance from their peers.

As part of the instructions covering Parts One through Three of the questionnaire, students were requested to ask questions if there was something they could not understand, had difficulty answering, and so on. Either the examiner or their teacher dealt with these questions on an individual basis. Students handed in their completed questionnaires to the examiner.

After the completed questionnaires from all three schools had been returned, the examiner numbered each questionnaire in preparation for the data analysis. Questionnaires were optically scored.

Instruments

The questionnaire (see Appendix B) consisted of three parts. Students responded to all three parts on

the optical scoring sheets that were provided them. Part one consisted of a demographic questionnaire. Part two consisted of eight questions designed to solicit individual and family information on the subjects. Part three consisted of the CRPBI-R. These three parts are discussed below. Information on the development, factor analyses, reliability, and validity of the CRPBI-R can be found in Chapter II.

1. Part one consisted of eight demographic questions which could be responded to by the students with either one word or one number. Students wrote their responses to the questions in the spaces provided on the optical scoring sheet, and shaded in the appropriate circle corresponding to the letters or numerals of their response. The questions were as follows:

(a) Name of the country of the student's mother's birth.

(b) Name of the country of the student's father's birth.

(c) Student's sex.

(d) Student's grade.

(e) Student's birth date.

(f) Student's mother's years of schooling.

(g) Student's father's years of schooling.

(h) Number of years student had resided in Canada, to the nearest year.

2. Part two consisted of eight multiple choice Likert scale format questions. Four of the questions dealt with student's reports of academic performance and aspirations: the amount of pressure from parents to perform scholastically; student's academic performance; number of courses failed; and how far the students planned on going in school. Two of the questions dealt with the student's household: occupants of the household; and the primary disciplinarian of the household. The final two questions were designed to solicit information from the non Canadian-born students about conflict between their culture of origin and Canadian culture. The first question asked students to assess the extent to which they felt caught in the middle between their parents ways of doing things and those of their teachers and peer group. The second question asked students to assess the extent their parents required them to be present when they had to meet with their teachers.

3. Part three consisted of the CRPBI-R.[2] The CRPBI-R consists of separate, identical forms to be completed by the respondent: one for the mother, and one for the father. For this study, these forms were unified into a combined "parents" form to ease data

analysis. Apart from pluralizing verbs contained in questions to apply to both parents, no other modifications were made in the CRPBI-R.

The CRPBI-R is an eighteen scale inventory that consists of 108 statements about parental behaviors to which the subject responds in a Likert format by circling response A if the statement is like his parents; circling response B if the statement is somewhat like his parents; and circling response C if the statement is not like his parents.

The eighteen scales have been found in repeated studies to load on three factors originally formulated by Schaefer (1965b). These factors are termed Acceptance versus Rejection, Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy, and Firm Control versus Lax Control. The factors, along with the scales which make them up, are presented below. Scales marked with an asterisk "*" are reversed scales.

1. Factor One: Acceptance versus Rejection: Acceptance, Childcenteredness, Possessiveness, Rejection*, Positive Involvement, Acceptance of Individuation, Hostile Detachment*.

2. Factor Two: Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy: Intrusiveness, Control through Guilt, Hostile Control, Inconsistent Discipline, Instilling Persistent Anxiety, Withdrawal of Relations.

3. Factor Three: Firm Control Versus Lax Control: Control, Enforcement, Nonenforcement*, Lax Discipline*, Extreme Autonomy*.

In the CRPBI-R, scale scores range from 10 to 30. For normal scales, higher scores reveal higher levels of that scale's perceived parental behavior. With reversed scales, higher scores reveal lower levels of perceived parental behavior. Factor scores on the CRPBI-R also range from 10 to 30, with scores in the higher range on each factor indicating high reported parental Acceptance, Psychological Control, and Firm Control respectively.

Analysis of Data

After all the questionnaires were completed, student responses were computer coded in preparation for the data analysis. Students were divided on the basis of their responses to the demographic portion of the questionnaire into countries of origin. The following decision rules were employed to determine country of origin: (a) The country of parent's birth, in cases where the student's mother and father were born in the same country, and (b) the country of father's birth, in cases where the student's mother and father were born in different countries. These are the

same procedures used by Statistics Canada to determine country of origin.

After the respondents were assigned countries of origin, they were divided into five geographic blocs. The decision rule employed for this assignment was primarily geographic proximity, and secondarily adequate group representation for the purposes of statistical analysis. Respondents that could not be readily assigned to a geographic bloc were eliminated from this analysis, reducing the size of the sample from 477 to 455 students.

These five geographic blocs were termed "Latin American", "Asian", "Europe", "Middle East", and "West". The Latin America bloc contained respondents from Central and South America. The Asia bloc contained countries of origin from India eastward to Japan, with the majority of respondents being of Indian, Vietnamese, or Chinese ethnic origin. The Europe bloc consisted of countries of origin extending from east of the United Kingdom to the Soviet Union. The majority of respondents here were of Polish, Italian, or Portugese origin. The Middle East bloc consisted almost entirely of respondents of Lebanese origin. The West bloc consisted almost entirely of respondents from Canada, with a small minority being from the United Kingdom.

Statistical Analysis

Three primary forms of statistical analyses were employed in this study: factor analysis, Pearson product moment correlational analysis, and analysis of variance. Throughout the study, a non-directional alpha level of .05 was used as the criterion.

The data analysis section concludes with a brief discussion of the statistical techniques used to test the research questions posed in Chapter I.

1. Research Question One: Is the factor structure of the CRPBI-R maintained for this sample? To address research question one, a reliability analysis, Pearson correlation, and a series of factor analyses were conducted with the data from the sample.

2. Research Question Two: Are there significant differences with the CRPBI-R between students of different ethnic groups? To address research question two, analyses of variance were employed with ethnicity as the independent variable and CRPBI-R scale and factor scores as the dependent variables.

3. Research Question Three: Are there significant differences in perception of parent-adolescent relations as measured by the CRPBI-R between students who are recent immigrants and students who have lived in Canada for more than ten years? To address research question three, analyses of variance were employed with

years in Canada as the independent variable and CRPBI-R scale and factor scores as the dependent variables.

4. Research Question Four: Are there significant differences with the CRPBI-R between students of different sexes, socioeconomic levels, ages, and scholastic abilities? To address research question four, the sex and socioeconomic level demographic variables were assessed in conjunction with research questions two and three. The age and scholastic ability demographic variables were assessed by means of Pearson product moment correlation, with CRPBI-R scale scores as the dependent variables.

Footnotes

[2]The scoring key for the CRPBI-R can be obtained in Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a).

CHAPTER IV

Results

The discussion of results is divided into individual sections on the basis of the following research questions which were presented in the introductory chapter:

1. Is the factor structure of the CRPBI-R maintained for the present multi-ethnic sample?

2. Are there significant differences in CRPBI-R scores between students of different ethnic groups?

3. Are there significant differences in perception of parent-adolescent relations as as measured by the CRPBI-R between students who are recent immigrants and students who have lived in Canada for more than five years?

4. Are there significant differences with the CRPBI-R between students of different sexes, socioeconomic levels, ages, and scholastic abilities?

Research Question One

To assess the first research question, whether the three-factor structure of the CRPBI-R as reported by Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a) was descriptive of the present sample, a number of analyses were conducted. The original norming groups, as explained

in Chapter II, consisted of North American high school and University students. Cross-cultural research with both the CRPBI and CRPBI-R has either focused on one specific ethnic group, or compared one ethnic group with North American adolescents. Consequently it was considered important to assess whether the CRPBI-R's three-factor, 18-scale structure would persist with a multi-ethnic group such as that of the present study.

Initially, a reliability analysis was conducted to assess the extent to which Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) scale items measured their respective eighteen scales for this sample. Results are presented in Table 4.

As can be seen from the table, alpha reliabilities for the eighteen scales of the CRPBI-R ranged from .51 to .88 for this sample. These data show that the items of nine CRPBI-R scales (those with an alpha of .70 or greater) consistently measured their respective scales, while the items of the other nine scales (those with an alpha of less than .70) varied to a greater extent in what they measured. The three scales with the highest reliabilities were Acceptance, Acceptance of Individuation, and Positive Involvement. The three scales with the lowest reliabilities were Nonenforcement, Possessiveness, and Inconsistent Discipline. Lower reliability scales had comparatively

less variance than did the higher reliability scales. It is evident that for this sample, these scales were comparatively less effective in measuring those aspects of perceived parental behavior. Higher reliability scales also contained more items than the lower reliability scales.

Table 4

Reliability Analysis of Scale Item Contents on CRPBI-R Scales (N = 420)

CRPBI-R Scale[a]	Alpha	Scale	Alpha	Scale	Alpha
1	.88	7	.83	13	.83
2	.80	8	.61	14	.58
3	.55	9	.60	15	.68
4	.80	10	.78	16	.82
5	.65	11	.57	17	.70
6	.69	12	.51	18	.79

[a]CRPBI-R Scales: 1. Acceptance, 2. Childcenteredness, 3. Possessiveness, 4. Rejection, 5. Control, 6. Enforcement, 7. Positive Involvement, 8. Intrusiveness, 9. Control through Guilt, 10. Hostile Control, 11. Inconsistent Discipline, 12. Nonenforcement, 13. Acceptance of Individuation, 14. Lax Discipline, 15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety, 16. Hostile Detachment, 17. Withdrawal of Relations, 18. Extreme Autonomy.

To assess the extent to which scales and factors of the CRPBI-R designated by Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a) correlated with one another for the sample in this study, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated. Seventeen scales displayed correlations with their respective factor of

.60 or greater, and 12 of these had correlations of .75 or greater. The correlation between the Possessiveness scale and its factor, A/R, was .40.

A factor analysis was conducted on the data to determine Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) CRPBI-R scale loadings on a three-factor solution. With an eigenvalue of 1.0 as the cut-off criterion, three factors emerged from the analysis. After rotating orthogonally according to the Varimax solution, the resulting factors were very similar to those reported by Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a), and accounted for 68.6 percent of the total cumulative variance. Table 5 presents these rotated factor loadings. Scales with loadings above +.40 or -.40, the same criterion used in Schludermann and Schludermann (1970b, 1971) are designated by an asterisk.

Inspection of Table 5 shows that the factor structure of the CRPBI-R for this sample corresponded quite closely to that reported by Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a). As the authors presented no data giving scale loadings in that paper, varimax rotated scale loadings are provided in Appendix A for Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970b, 1971) studies, for purposes of comparison.

Table 5

Varimax Rotated Matrix of CRPBI-R Scale Loadings on Factors

CRPBI-R Scale[b]	A/R[a]	PC/PA	FC/LC
1	.92*	-.01	-.05
2	.85*	.23	-.16
3	.38	.70	-.07
4	.77*	-.46	-.01
5	-.05	.61	.52*
6	-.24	.62	.46*
7	.90*	.09	-.03
8	.15	.72*	.22
9	-.10	.77*	-.06
10	-.47	.72*	.20
11	-.48	.41*	-.30
12	.21	-.06	.76*
13	.80*	-.12	-.24
14	-.23	.04	.81*
15	-.37	.73*	.10
16	.83*	-.35	.10
17	-.53	.49*	-.13
18	-.11	.24	.73*

Note. * designates scales that load on the same factor as in Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a).
[a]CRPBI-R Factors: A/R = Acceptance vs. Rejection, PC/PA = Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy, FC/LC = Firm Control vs. Lax Control.
[b]CRPBI-R Scales: 1. Acceptance, 2. Childcenteredness, 3. Possessiveness, 4. Rejection, 5. Control, 6. Enforcement, 7. Positive Involvement, 8. Intrusiveness, 9. Control through Guilt, 10. Hostile Control, 11. Inconsistent Discipline, 12. Nonenforcement, 13. Acceptance of Individuation, 14. Lax Discipline, 15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety, 16. Hostile Detachment, 17. Withdrawal of Relations, 18. Extreme Autonomy.

An additional factor analysis was conducted to assess scale item loadings on a three-factor solution. The criterion for assessing scale item loadings on a factor was again loadings above +.40 or -.40. Eighty

percent of the CRPBI-R items loaded on the same factors as outlined in Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a).

In summary, reliability analysis, Pearson correlation, and factor analysis showed that the CRPBI-R retained its characteristics when applied to the multi-ethnic sample of the present study. It was concluded that data analyses with this sample could be performed with both the CRPBI-R scales and its three factorial dimensions.

Research Question Two

To assess the second research question, the extent and direction of differences on the CRPBI-R between students of different ethnic groups, the students were first grouped on the basis of their responses to the demographic portion of the questionnaire into five geographic blocs, as outlined in Chapter III. The student's mean scores for the 18 CRPBI-R scales and the 3 CRPBI-R factors, by geographic bloc, are presented in Table 6.

The total number of students in the five geographic blocs was 460. Seventeen students who had participated in the study could not be categorized by geographic bloc, and they were not included in this analysis.

Table 6

Mean CRPBI-R Scale Scores by Geographic Bloc. (N = 455)

CRPBI-R Scale[a]	West	Latin America	Asia	Europe	Middle East
Frequency:	238	22	120	58	17
1	22.18	23.18	21.40	22.09	25.37
2	20.07	22.73	21.85	21.21	26.47
3	18.56	21.66	22.18	20.78	23.41
4	23.44	22.90	22.55	23.38	23.97
5	19.40	18.91	20.38	19.28	20.35
6	16.90	16.54	17.42	17.62	16.59
7	22.00	23.33	21.33	22.16	25.88
8	18.26	18.73	19.78	18.93	22.47
9	17.52	19.73	21.03	19.14	22.82
10	17.61	18.81	19.89	18.68	20.37
11	17.36	17.20	18.12	16.93	18.24
12	24.04	23.46	22.15	24.14	22.35
13	22.48	24.26	21.87	21.52	24.56
14	21.10	21.70	19.92	22.31	19.65
15	16.73	17.64	19.23	18.21	19.18
16	24.05	24.66	22.86	24.43	25.74
17	16.18	16.93	18.74	16.59	17.88
18	21.76	22.73	22.27	23.93	21.29
CRPBI-R Factor[b]					
A/R	21.85	23.42	22.07	22.24	25.06
PC/PA	17.26	18.33	19.50	17.98	20.16
FC/LC	20.83	20.51	20.40	21.43	20.05

[a]CRPBI-R Scales: 1. Acceptance, 2. Childcenteredness, 3. Possessiveness, 4. Rejection, 5. Control, 6. Enforcement, 7. Positive Involvement, 8. Intrusiveness, 9. Control through Guilt, 10. Hostile Control, 11. Inconsistent Discipline, 12. Nonenforcement, 13. Acceptance of Individuation, 14. Lax Discipline, 15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety, 16. Hostile Detachment, 17. Withdrawal of Relations, 18. Extreme Autonomy.

[b]CRPBI-R Factors: A/R = Acceptance vs. Rejection, PC/PA = Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy, FC/LC = Firm Control vs. Lax Control.

A comparison of Table 6 with Table 1 shows that CRPBI-R factor means for the West group of the present

sample were similar to those reported by Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a) for their Winnipeg high school norming group. Mean scores for the Psychological Control factor were higher for students in all geographic blocs of the present sample than those reported by Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a).

Initial data analysis was by analysis of variance, with geographic bloc as the independent variable, and CRPBI-R scale scores as the dependent variables. This initial analysis showed large significant differences between geographic blocs on ten of the eighteen CRPBI-R scales. These scales were: Childcenteredness, Possessiveness, Withdrawal of Relations, Intrusiveness, Control through Guilt, Hostile Control, Nonenforcement, Lax Discipline, Instilling Persistent Anxiety, and Positive Involvement. Differences between blocs in nine of these scales were significant at the .001 level. Differences for Positive Involvement were significant at the .01 alpha level.

In light of these results, further analysis was conducted to determine the influence of demographic variables on differences between ethnic bloc means, following the cautions from the literature reviews of Goldin (1969) and Martin (1975), outlined in Chapter II. Past research with the CRPBI (Litovsky and Dusek, 1985; Margolies and Weintraub, 1977; Renson, Schaefer, and Levy 1968; Rohner and Pattingill, 1985; Schaefer,

1965b; Schludermann and Schludermann, 1970b, 1971, 1983) has consistently found sex of the respondents to be an important independent variable. Consequently, a two-way analysis of variance (geographic bloc X sex) was conducted for the eighteen scales of the CRPBI-R. Table 7 presents the CRPBI-R scale score F values for this geographic bloc by sex analysis of variance.

Table 7

CRPBI-R Scale Score F Values for Geographic Bloc by Sex Analysis of Variance (N = 452)

CRPBI-R Scale[a]	Geographic Bloc (4,442)	Sex (1,442)	Bloc X Sex (Interaction) (4,442)
1	2.76*	0.40	0.15
2	7.99***	4.38*	0.54
3	21.32***	13.41***	1.17
4	0.71	2.54	0.56
5	1.44	3.59	0.71
6	0.77	0.08	0.92
7	3.93**	0.36	0.13
8	4.79***	4.23*	0.56
9	16.65***	1.01	1.81
10	5.36***	1.53	0.93
11	0.86	1.48	1.46
12	5.24***	0.12	1.29
13	2.92*	0.40	0.16
14	6.77***	0.17	0.51
15	5.44***	0.34	0.84
16	2.63*	0.37	0.81
17	5.53***	2.93	1.01
18	2.12	18.93***	0.24

[a]CRPBI-R Scales: 1. Acceptance, 2. Childcenteredness, 3. Possessiveness, 4. Rejection, 5. Control, 6. Enforcement, 7. Positive Involvement, 8. Intrusiveness, 9. Control through Guilt, 10. Hostile Control, 11. Inconsistent Discipline, 12. Nonenforcement, 13. Acceptance of Individuation, 14. Lax Discipline, 15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety, 16. Hostile Detachment, 17. Withdrawal of Relations, 18. Extreme Autonomy.
*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

As can be seen from Table 7, the variable accounting for by far the largest amount of variance in CRPBI-R scale scores was geographic bloc. A multiple comparisons procedure with alpha set at .05 was conducted to determine the direction of geographic bloc differences. Table 8 displays the significant differences for CRPBI-R scale scores found in multiple comparisons between geographic blocs, using the Scheffe test.

Table 8

Multiple Comparisons By Geographic Blocs[a] for Table 7 Analysis of Variance

CRPBI-R Scale[b]	
Childcenteredness[1]	Middle East>West, Middle East>Europe, Middle East>Asia
Possessiveness[1]	Middle East>West, Asia>West, Latin America>West, Europe>West
Positive Involvement[1]	Middle East>Asia, Middle East>West
Intrusiveness[2]	Middle East>West
Control through Guilt[2]	Middle East>West, Asia>West
Hostile Control[2]	Asia>West
Nonenforcement*[3]	Europe>Asia, West>Asia
Lax Discipline*[3]	Europe>Asia, West>Asia
Instilling Anxiety[2]	Asia>West
Withdrawal of Relations[2]	Asia>West

Note. "*" designates reversed scales.
[a]Pairwise comparisons are ordered by largest to smallest significant difference in means.
[b]Superscripts by scales indicate the CRPBI-R factors. 1 = Acceptance vs. Rejection, 2 = Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy, 3 = Firm Control vs. Lax Control.

Table 8 shows that most of the differences in geographic bloc CRPBI-R scale scores could be accounted for by differences between either the Middle East or Asia groups and the West or Europe groups. Respondents from the West had significantly higher scores than other blocs on only two of the scales, Nonenforcement and Lax Discipline, showing that they perceived lower levels of this behavior from their parents than did their Asia counterparts. In almost all the other significant CRPBI-R scales, Middle East and Asia students perceived their parents as exhibiting that scale's behavior to a greater extent than did their West and European counterparts.

To further study these differences, another two-way (geographic bloc X sex) analysis of variance was conducted for the three factorial dimensions of the CRPBI-R. Table 9 presents the CRPBI-R factor score F values for the geographic bloc by sex analysis of variance. Results of multiple comparison procedures for this analysis are also displayed in Table 9. As Scheffe post hoc comparisons are relatively insensitive when comparing small groups such as these, the Student Newman-Keuls or "SNK" post hoc comparison procedure was employed (Ferguson, 1989).

Table 9

CRPBI-R Factor Score F Values for Geographic Bloc by Sex Analysis of Variance (N = 464)

CRPBI-R Factor[a]	Geographic Bloc (4,454)	Sex (1,454)	Bloc X Sex (Interaction) (4,454)
A/R	3.93**	0.63	0.17
PC/PA	10.43***	3.55	0.75
FC/LC	1.32	4.60*	0.35

Note. Pairwise comparisons between geographic blocs ordered from largest to smallest significant difference in means were as follows: 1. A/R: Middle East>West, Middle East>Asia, Middle East>Europe. 2. PC/PA: Middle East>West, Asia>West, Middle East>Europe, Asia>Europe.

[a]CRPBI-R Factors: A/R = Acceptance vs. Rejection, PC/PA = Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy, FC/LC = Firm Control vs. Lax Control.

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

The results displayed in Table 9 obtained in the analysis of variance for the factorial dimensions of the CRPBI-R serve to summarize the results for the CRPBI-R scale dimensions discussed above. Multiple comparisons with alpha set at .05 showed that CRPBI-R A/R differences in factor scores could be accounted for by higher Acceptance factor scores for the Middle East group as opposed to the West, Asia, and Europe groups. PC/PA differences were due to higher Psychological Control factor scores for the Middle East and Asia groups as opposed to the West and Europe groups. For the FC/LC factor dimension of the CRPBI-R, only sex differences were significant, and those were quite

small. Although no multiple comparisons were performed for the sex variable, inspection of means showed that sex differences were due to female respondents perceiving their parents as somewhat higher in Firm Control than males.

To test for differences between ethnic groups within geographic blocs, students were grouped on the basis of their response to the demographic portion of the questionnaire into eleven countries of origin, and an analysis of variance was performed. These eleven countries were: Canada, Latin America, Vietnam, China, India, Italy, Lebanon, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, and England. As with geographic blocs, students were once again grouped on the basis of their father's country of birth. An analysis of variance was performed for the country of origin variable for the CRPBI-R factors. Table 10 displays the CRPBI-R factor score F values for the country of origin analysis of variance. Results of multiple comparison procedures with the SNK statistic for this analysis are also displayed in Table 10.

Table 10

CRPBI-R Factor Score F Values for Country Analysis of Variance (N = 434, df = 10,423)

CRPBI-R Factor[a]	F
A/R	2.43**
PC/PA	4.79***
FC/LC	1.12

Note. Pairwise comparisons between Country groups ordered from largest to smallest significant difference in means were as follows: 1. A/R: Lebanon>China. 2. PC/PA: China>Canada, Vietnam>Canada, India>Canada.
[a]CRPBI-R Factors: A/R = Acceptance vs. Rejection, PC/PA = Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy, FC/LC = Firm Control vs. Lax Control.
*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

As can be seen from the multiple comparisons in Table 10, the results from the country of origin analysis of variance were very similar to those obtained in the geographic bloc by sex analysis of variance. There were no significant differences between countries within a previously assigned geographic bloc, only differences between countries of different geographic blocs.

Research Question Three

To study the relationship between number of years in Canada and perception of parent-adolescent relations, a series of analyses of variance were carried out. Students in the sample were assigned on

the basis of their response to the questionnaire to three groups: (a) students residing in Canada for five years or less, (b) students residing in Canada for more than five years, and (c) students who were born in Canada. For the analysis of variance, these groups were assigned levels 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

Due to the relatively small effects observed for sex in the previous analyses, the data were pooled by sex. Two-way analyses of variance were conducted to test Research Question Three, with "Years in Canada" and "Education of Parents" as the independent variables. Education of Parents was used as a measure of socioeconomic status of the student's family (Schaefer, 1965a). Martin (1975) and Goldin (1969) have discussed the importance of socioeconomic status as related to parental childrearing behavior.

Students in the sample were divided on the basis of their response to the questionnaire into three groups based on parents education: (a) zero thru six years of school, (b) seven thru twelve years of school, and (c) greater than twelve years of school. For the analysis of variance, these groups were assigned levels 1, 2, and 3 respectively. Separate analyses of variance were conducted based on father's and mother's years of schooling. Father's educational level was determined to be the source of greater variance in

CRPBI-R scores than was mother's educational level, and was therefore used to test for the persistence of group differences in the primary independent variable of interest, Years in Canada.

Table 11 presents the CRPBI-R scale score F values for the two-way (Years in Canada X Father's Education) analysis of variance.

Table 11

CRPBI-R Scale Score F Values for Years in Canada and Father's Education Analysis of Variance (N = 444)

CRPBI-R Scale[a]	Years in Canada (2,435)	Father's Education (2,435)	Interaction (4,435)
1	0.41	11.83***	0.16
2	10.91***	3.85*	0.70
3	40.41***	1.00	1.50
4	1.46	5.29**	1.23
5	1.73	0.76	1.44
6	1.10	0.34	0.89
7	0.74	9.37***	0.78
8	7.91***	1.09	1.54
9	24.75***	0.80	0.54
10	10.69***	0.99	1.29
11	2.30	3.16*	0.51
12	6.02**	2.43	0.78
13	3.39*	8.69***	0.90
14	7.71***	0.28	0.95
15	13.32***	1.41	0.56
16	0.63	11.85***	1.08
17	7.86***	0.38	1.20
18	1.62	0.40	1.60

[a]CRPBI-R Scales: 1. Acceptance, 2. Childcenteredness, 3. Possessiveness, 4. Rejection, 5. Control, 6. Enforcement, 7. Positive Involvement, 8. Intrusiveness, 9. Control through Guilt, 10. Hostile Control, 11. Inconsistent Discipline, 12. Nonenforcement, 13. Acceptance of Individuation, 14. Lax Discipline, 15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety, 16. Hostile Detachment, 17. Withdrawal of Relations, 18. Extreme Autonomy.
*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

It can be seen from a comparison of Tables 11 and 7 that, in general the same CRPBI-R scales discriminated between groups, whether by Geographic Blocs or Years in Canada.

Comparisons between Years in Canada groups using Scheffe post hoc comparisons are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Multiple Comparisons By Years in Canada[a] for Table 11 Analysis of Variance

CRPBI-R Scale[b]	
Childcenteredness[1]	1>3, 2>3
Possessiveness[1]	1>3, 1>2, 2>3
Intrusiveness[2]	1>3
Control through Guilt[2]	1>3, 1>2, 2>3
Hostile Control[2]	1>3, 2>3
Nonenforcement*[3]	3>1
Acceptance of Individuation[1]	1>2
Lax Discipline*[3]	3>1, 2>1
Instilling Anxiety[2]	1>3, 1>2
Withdrawal of Relations[2]	1>3

Note. "*" designates reversed scales.
[a]Pairwise comparisons are ordered by largest to smallest significant difference in means for Years in Canada groups. 1 = 0 thru 5 years in Canada. 2 = 6 thru hi years in Canada. 3 = born in Canada.
[b]Superscripts by scales indicate the CRPBI-R factors. 1 = Acceptance versus Rejection, 2 = Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy, 3 = Firm Control versus Lax Control.

Differences in mean scores between Years in Canada groups in Table 12 could be primarily accounted for by differences in CRPBI-R scales which load on the PC/PA factorial dimension. Of the nineteen significant

paired comparisons displayed in Table 12, fourteen of them involved students who had resided in Canada for five years or less. In addition, as the ranking of the paired comparisons shows, mean differences between groups 1 and 3 were always larger than those between groups 1 and 2 or groups 2 and 3. In general, students not born in Canada, particularly those residing in Canada five years or less, perceived their parents as higher in the use of Psychological Control - CRPBI-R factor PC/PA - than students born in Canada.

In addition to studying the effects for the Years in Canada variable, multiple comparisons were also performed to assess significant group differences in the Father's Education variable. These differences were primarily accounted for by differences in CRPBI-R scales loading on the A/R factorial dimension. In general, students with fathers having 13 years of education or more perceived their parents as more Accepting (higher in A/R) than those with fathers having 12 or less years of education.

Finally, Table 13 displays the F values for a similar two-way analysis of variance (Years in Canada X Father's education) conducted for the three CRPBI-R factorial dimensions. These results are presented in Table 13. Results of Scheffe post hoc multiple

comparison procedures for this analysis are also displayed in Table 13.

Table 13

CRPBI-R Factor Score F Values for Years in Canada and Father's Education Analysis of Variance (N = 455)

CRPBI-R Factor[a]	Years in Canada (2,446)	Father's Education (2,446)	Interaction (4,446)
A/R	2.80	8.79***	0.45
PC/PA	19.09***	0.94	1.42
FC/LC	0.54	0.62	1.84

Note. Pairwise comparisons between Years in Canada groups ordered from largest to smallest significant difference in means were as follows: PC/PA: 1>3, 1>2, 2>3. (1 = 0 thru 5 years in Canada. 2 = 6 thru hi years in Canada. 3 = born in Canada.)
[a]CRPBI-R Factors: 1. A/R: Acceptance versus Rejection, 2. PC/PA: Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy, 3. FC/LC: Firm Control versus Lax Control.
*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

As can be seen from Table 13, the largest group differences for the Years in Canada variable were on the PC/PA factorial dimension, reinforcing the findings for CRPBI-R scales discussed above.

Research Question Four

The fourth research question was concerned with the relationships between selected demographic, individual, and family variables and perception of parent-adolescent relations with the CRPBI-R. Sex of respondent and socioeconomic status (as assessed by

years of education of father) were studied in the context of their relationship with geographical bloc membership and years of residence in Canada, and the findings have been presented above.

As discussed in Chapter II, a number of other variables have been found to effect perception of parent-adolescent relations with the CRPBI-R. Table 14 presents the results of a Pearson product moment correlation between variables assessed with the questionnaire and CRPBI-R scale scores. Following is a description of the primary variables studied in this analysis:

1. Variable A: Age of student.

2. Variable B: Sex of student.

3. Variable C: Years of residence in Canada of student.

4. Variable D: Academic aspirations of student. This variable was assessed by one questionnaire item that asked students how far they wished to go in their schooling.

5. Variables E and F: Reported academic ability of student. These variables were assessed by two questionnaire items, one asking students their average in school, and one asking students how many courses they had failed.

Table 14

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between CRPBI-R Scales and Selected Variables (N = 477)

Demographic Variable	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
A		.01	-.31[c]	-.06	-.07	.01	-.17[c]	.03	-.04
B	.01		.09[a]	.01	-.07	.00	.00	.01	-.03
C	-.31[c]	.08[a]		-.09[a]	-.05	.08[a]	.00	.11[b]	.29[c]
D	-.06	.01	-.09[a]		.22[c]	-.20[c]	.16[c]	.01	-.09[a]
E	-.07	.07	-.05	.22[c]		-.42[c]	-.02	.03	.00
F	.00	.00	.08[a]	-.20[c]	-.42[c]		.01	-.05	.07
G	-.17[c]	.00	.00	.16[c]	-.02	.01		-.15[c]	-.11[b]
H	.03	.01	.11[b]	.01	.03	-.05	-.15[c]		.15[c]
I	-.04	-.03	.29[c]	-.09[a]	.00	.07	-.11[b]	.15[c]	
CRPBI-R Scale									
1	.03	.02	-.02	.05	.07	-.13[b]	.05	.16[c]	-.02
2	.05	.06	-.23[c]	.02	.00	-.08[a]	.04	.05	-.10[a]
3	.07	.12[b]	-.41[c]	.04	.00	-.06	.16[c]	-.17[c]	-.22[c]
4	.01	-.06	.07	.06	.11[b]	-.12[b]	-.06	.23[c]	.01
5	-.09[a]	.09[a]	-.09[a]	.06	-.02	.01	.30[c]	-.18[c]	-.09[b]
6	-.06	.02	-.08[a]	-.01	-.08[a]	.03	.20[c]	-.19[c]	-.10[a]
7	.00	.03	-.05	.01	.03	-.12[b]	.07	.12[b]	-.05
8	.00	.07	-.19[c]	.04	-.05	.01	.29[c]	-.23[c]	-.17[c]
9	.14[c]	.02	-.34[c]	.06	-.04	.03	.16[c]	-.18[c]	-.15[c]
10	-.04	.05	-.22[c]	.00	-.05	.09[a]	.26[c]	-.28[c]	-.18[c]
11	-.02	.04	-.05	.01	-.12[b]	.10[a]	.06	-.17[c]	-.05
12	-.06	.07	.16[c]	.08	.02	.01	.23[c]	-.06	.00
13	.09[a]	-.03	-.04	.02	.04	-.10[a]	-.06	.20[c]	.01
14	-.13[b]	.02	.18[c]	-.02	.01	.05	.26[c]	-.13[b]	.03
15	.03	.01	-.23[c]	-.02	-.14[c]	.12[b]	.26[c]	-.21[c]	-.12[b]
16	-.04	-.01	.06	.11[b]	.12[b]	-.14[c]	.06	.15[c]	.03
17	.02	.05	-.19[c]	-.01	-.05	.07	.03	-.19[c]	-.08[a]
18	-.12[b]	.22[c]	-.02	.12[b]	.03	.01	.35[c]	-.14[c]	-.06

Note. CRPBI-R Scales: 1. Acceptance, 2. Childcenteredness, 3. Possessiveness, 4. Rejection, 5. Control, 6. Enforcement, 7. Positive Involvement, 8. Intrusiveness, 9. Control through Guilt, 10. Hostile Control, 11. Inconsistent Discipline, 12. Nonenforcement, 13. Acceptance of Individuation, 14. Lax Discipline, 15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety, 16. Hostile Detachment, 17. Withdrawal of Relations, 18. Extreme Autonomy.

Note. See text for definition of demographic Variables A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I.

[a]$p<.05$, [b]$p<.01$, [c]$p<001$.

6. Variable G: Perceived academic pressure from parents. This variable was assessed by one questionnaire item that asked students how much pressure was placed upon them by their parents to do well in school.

7. Variables H and I: Conflict between cultures. These variables were assessed by two questionnaire items. One question asked students to what extent they felt caught in the middle between their parent's - presumably traditional - ways of doing things and those of their peers. The other question asked students to what extent they had to be present - presumably as interpreters - whenever their parents talked to one of their teachers. Variable H attempted to assess the extent to which students perceived conflict between the cultural traditions of the parents and those of their peers. Variable I attempted to assess the extent to which students were required to act as intermediaries for their parents, or as "culture brokers" (Canadian Task Force on Mental Health Issues Affecting Immigrants and Refugees, p. 68).

As can be seen in Table 14, the Age variable was significantly correlated with a number of the CRPBI-R scales. Older students perceived their parents as exercising greater Control through Guilt, Lax Discipline, Acceptance of Individuation, Extreme

Autonomy, and less Control. There was a significant negative correlation between Age and Variable G, amount of pressure from parents to perform academically. Younger students felt more of this kind of pressure from their parents than did the older students.

The Sex variable was significantly correlated with only three CRPBI-R scales. It appears that for the sample as a whole, sex of students did not effect their responses a great deal. This supported the findings in the Geographic Bloc by Sex analysis of variance. In addition, sex correlated most highly with CRPBI-R scales loading on the FC/LC factor dimension, as was found in a previous analysis (Table 9).

Variable C, Years of residence in Canada, displayed significant correlations with eleven of the eighteen CRPBI-R scales, nine of these correlations significant at the .01 level and beyond. Years of residence in Canada, and consequently ethnic origin, seemed to be a significant variable in determining how adolescents in this sample perceived their parent's behavior. A comparison of Table 14 with Table 11 shows that the same CRPBI-R scales displayed a relationship to years of residence in Canada, irrespective of the interactive effects of Father's Education.

Variables E and F, reported academic ability, had a large negative correlation with one another, as would

be expected. In general, the two variables were also related to the same CRPBI-R scales. All but one of the significant correlations for these two variables were with CRPBI-R scales loading on the A/R and the PC/LC factors. In general, students of lower reported academic ability saw their parents as more rejecting and as exercising more psychological control. There was no relationship between reported academic ability and years of residence in Canada.

Variable G, perceived academic pressure from parents, also correlated significantly with a number of CRPBI-R scales. Students who perceived greater academic pressure saw their parents as using more Firm Control and Psychological Control. Perceived academic pressure was unrelated to years of residence in Canada.

CHAPTER V

Summary and Implications

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between perception of parent-adolescent relations, as assessed by the CRPBI-R (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970a), and the variables of ethnicity and years of residency in Canada. In addition, the study sought to determine whether the factor structure of the CRPBI-R would be maintained for the present sample, and to investigate the relationship between selected individual and demographic variables on perception of parent-adolescent relations.

Four hundred seventy-seven Edmonton high school students participated in the study, 97 of whom were selected on the basis of attendance at English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, and were consequently newcomers to Canada. Students completed a questionnaire that consisted of demographic, individual, and family questions, and a version of the CRPBI-R that was modified to be applicable to both parents of the student. Data were primarily grouped on the basis of ethnicity and years of residency in Canada of the respondent.

The present study emerged in the context of previous findings in four primary areas. First,

researchers have found ethnic differences in perception of parent-adolescent and parent-child relations with the CRPBI or the CRPBI-R (Rohner, 1985; Saavedra, 1980; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1971, 1983), and with similar instruments such as the PARQ (Rohner, 1986; Rohner, Roll, & Rohner, 1980). Second, previous research has found differences in parent-adolescent relations between native-born residents and immigrants (Magan, Weller, & Klahr, 1976; Rosenthal, 1984). In addition, the conflict between immigrant adolescents and their parents has been underlined by many reviewers of the cross-cultural literature (Rosenthal, 1984; Salvendy, 1983; Stein, 1982; Aronowitz, 1982). The third area of research has determined that a number of demographic variables influence parent-adolescent relations (Goldin, 1969; Martin, 1975; Schaefer, 1965a). The present study sought to assess the relationship between perception of parental behavior as assessed by the CRPBI-R and variables including sex, age, socioeconomic status, and scholastic ability. Fourth, previous research has determined the factor structure of both the CRPBI and CRPBI-R to remain stable in work with samples of different ethnic groups (Renson, Schaefer, & Levy, 1968; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1971, 1983). It was important however to determine whether the three-factor interpretation of

the CRPBI-R, the utility of which has been established by reviewers such as Goldin (1969), would be valid for an ethnically varied sample.

The findings will be discussed in detail below. In summary, results from the study were indicative both of ethnic differences, and differences by years of residency in Canada in perception of parent-adolescent relations. A number of demographic, individual, and family variables were also related to perception of parent-adolescent relations. In addition, the factor structure of the CRPBI-R was maintained for the multi-ethnic sample that was used.

Discussion

Research Question One

Results of preliminary analyses confirmed the utility of interpreting student's scores by Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970a) factor structure. Item-scale reliabilities ranged from .51 to .88, and most CRPBI-R scales displayed correlations of .75 or greater with CRPBI-R factors. Factor analysis of CRPBI-R scale loadings on a three-factor solution indicated the resulting three factors to be very similar in scale contents to those reported by the authors, accounting for 68.6 percent of the total variance. Factor analysis of item loadings on a

3-factor solution determined individual CRPBI-R items loaded on their respective factors in a similar manner to loadings reported in Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a, 1970b, 1971).

These findings were consistent with those of Schludermann and Schludermann (1971, 1983), and supported the use of the CRPBI-R's scales and factors in interpreting the results of further analyses with this sample.

Research Question Two

Results were consistent with previous research (Schludermann and Schludermann, 1971, 1983) in finding significant differences between ethnic groups in CRPBI-R scores. Analyses of variance revealed that significant differences between geographic blocs were primarily due to higher perceived Psychological Control for Middle East and Asia blocs, and higher perceived Acceptance for Middle East students, as compared to West students. West and Europe respondents scored higher than their Asia counterparts on only two scales of the CRPBI-R, and these scales were indicative of higher perceived parental Firm Control. Most of the Asian students perceived their parents as using psychological disciplinary methods rather than physical measures.

The largest difference in CRPBI-R scores was on the PC/PA factor, between the Asia bloc and the West bloc. The majority of Asia bloc respondents were from China, Vietnam, or India - all comparatively traditional societies (McGoldrick, 1982). As Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) have noted, traditional societies tend to use psychological control disciplinary methods, such as emotional appeal to family shame (Ho, 1987), to a greater extent than do Western societies. Family roles tend also to be well-defined in traditional societies such as these. Discipline from the parents, and a hierarchy of family authority is accepted to a larger extent than in Western societies (Taylor, 1988), in what Rosenthal (1984) has termed a "positional control system" based on the authority of age and status seniority. Consequently, adolescents from traditional societies would perceive their parents as exercising greater Psychological Control.

High scores for the Middle East students on the CRPBI-R Acceptance factorial dimension could be related to childrearing practices in the Middle East. Most respondents in this geographic bloc were from Lebanon, where children in the early years of life are raised in an atmosphere that has been described as "indulgent" (Prothro, 1961). Lebanese mothers often do not

discourage dependency from their children (Prothro, 1961). Perhaps this atmosphere of indulgence and sometimes active encouragement of dependency relates to Lebanese adolescent's perceptions of high parental Acceptance. High Middle East PC/PA factor scores, as compared to those of respondents from the West, may possibly be related to the traditional nature of Lebanese society, in a similar manner as is the case for the societies constituting the Asia bloc. As in Asian societies, parental roles are well-defined, standards of conformity are rigid, and Psychological Control methods such as scolding and threatening are used frequently (Prothro, 1961).

High scores on the part of the Middle East students in the CRPBI-R PC/PA factor must be interpreted with some caution, however. The sample size was small, and no significant effects for this factor were noted in the analysis of variance by countries for Lebanon.

With analysis of variance at the country level, as opposed to the level of geographic blocs, it became apparent that CRPBI-R bloc differences in A/R were mostly due to high Acceptance scores on the part of the Lebanese respondents. For the PC/PA factor, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Indian students perceived higher levels

of parental Psychological Control than did the Canadian respondents.

Findings for the Indian students were similar to those of Schludermann and Schludermann (1983), who also reported higher PC/PA scores for East Indian adolescents as compared with Canadians. Schludermann and Schludermann's (1983) and Rohner's (1986) findings of higher A/R scores for Indian versus Canadian adolescents were not replicated in the present study. Although the mean A/R score for Indian respondents was higher than that for Canadian respondents, significance did not reach the .05 level of confidence.

Research Question Three

The third research question was concerned with the relationship between respondent's years of residency in Canada and perception of parental behavior. Results indicated that respondents residing in Canada for five years or less (recent immigrants) perceived higher levels of parental Psychological Control than did respondents living in Canada for more than five years. Respondents in Canada more than five years in turn perceived higher levels than respondents born in Canada.

The pattern of results was quite similar to those of the ethnicity analysis conducted previously. That

is, similar PC/PA CRPBI-R factor scales detected differences between the groups, and recent immigrants also perceived their parents as somewhat higher than other groups in the Acceptance factor. As in the ethnicity analysis, respondents born in Canada perceived higher levels of Firm Control than other groups.

There are alternative interpretations of higher perceived Psychological Control by the immigrant respondents. It is possible that these relatively high scores were related to ethnicity rather than years in Canada. In fact, the respondents making up the group who had resided in Canada for five years or less were mostly Asian in origin (66 percent). However, the interpretation in turn that the traditions of this group accounted for immigrants' higher perceived Parental Control cannot account for the results completely. The larger group of immigrants - those residing in Canada for more than five years, but not born in Canada - contained only a minority of Asian respondents (26 percent).

Alternatively, relatively higher levels of parental Psychological Control for the immigrant as opposed to the non-immigrant respondents may be related to other findings. Higher perceived Psychological Control would tend to adversely effect

parent-adolescent relations. Magan, Weller, and Klahr (1976), in their study with Israeli immigrant groups, hypothesized that adolescent's perception of intergenerational problems with their parents was associated with the cultural distance between the immigrant's home society and that of their host country. Rosenthal (1984) also interpreted findings of increased intergenerational conflict for immigrant adolescents in the context of conflict between culture of origin and that of the adopted culture. The findings of higher levels of perceived Psychological Control on the part of the immigrant respondents in the present study may be associated with greater intergenerational problems due to culture conflict in a similar fashion.

In his review of the literature on the emotional adjustment of immigrant children, Aronowitz (1983) cited numerous reports of conflict between immigrant children and their parents. Aronowitz cited theory from the social-anthropological literature which considers intergenerational conflict to stem from culture conflict for immigrant families.

In addition, a number of researchers have discussed the stressors placed on immigrant families during the migration process. These stressors are considered to adversely effect parent-adolescent

relations (Aronowitz, 1983; Salvendy, 1983; Stein, 1982). Berry, Kim, and Boski (1988) have used the term "acculturative stress" to refer to this special class of stressors. Certainly, such adverse relations would be reflected in student's responses on the CRPBI-R.

Interpretations must be made with caution, however. Although the largest group differences were in perceived Psychological Control, immigrant respondents also perceived somewhat higher parental Acceptance and lower Firm Control. The general pattern of perceived parental behaviors was similar to that found for the ethnicity variable. Consequently, the most plausible interpretation of the immigration analysis results is likely an interaction effect between the two variables of ethnicity and years of residency in Canada. A child is, after all, a product both of the traditions and values of his home culture, and a product of the experiences and pressures his family undergoes.

Research Question Four

The fourth research question was concerned with the influence of selected demographic, family, and individual variables on perception of parental behavior.

Sex.

Results from the geographic bloc by sex analyses of variance, and Pearson product moment correlation indicated that sex of respondent did not influence CRPBI-R scores to a large extent. Significant sex differences were indicated by only two CRPBI-R scales. Females in the sample perceived their parents as allowing them less autonomy and as being more possessive than did males. The weak effects for sex were similar to those observed by Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) and Rohner (1985) among Indian and Korean adolescents respectively. Rohner's Korean female adolescents also perceived less parental autonomy than did the males.

Age.

The age variable displayed a relationship with a number of CRPBI-R scales. In particular, older students perceived their parents as exercising less Firm Control. These results were reflected in the relationship between respondent's age and another variable, perceived pressure from parents to perform academically. Older students perceived significantly less pressure of this kind from their parents than did the younger students. As the majority of the students in the study were between the ages of 15 and 18, these findings seemed to support Montemayor (1983), who

concluded from his review of the literature that parent-adolescent conflict peaked during middle adolescence, and declined during late adolescence.

The older students seemed to pay a price for this decline in perceived parental control however: older students perceived greater Control through Guilt on the part of their parents than did younger students in this sample. Apparently, with increasing age, parents decrease their use of direct, physical disciplinary measures in favor of methods within the sphere of Psychological Control.

Reported academic ability.

Results for the two variables assessing reported academic ability were as expected. Students of lower reported ability saw their parents as more Rejecting and as exercising more Psychological Control. The findings were very similar to those of Nuttal and Nuttal's (1976) research with the CRPBI. With their North American high school sample, they found that higher levels of perceived parental Acceptance and lower levels of perceived Psychological Control were related to higher academic achievement traits.

The question of self-reported as opposed to objectively measured academic performance does not seem to be at issue with these findings. Other studies using more objective measures of academic performance

and academic ability have found similar results. In working with the PARQ, Starkey (1980) found a direct and positive relationship between children's perceptions of parental acceptance and their grade point average. In addition Hurley (1967), using other instruments, found a positive relationship to exist between parental acceptance and children's I.Q.

Another variable, perceived academic pressure from parents, was related to a number of CRPBI-R scale scores, more so than all but one of the demographic or individual variables. This finding was as expected, since it was the only variable which, like the CRPBI-R, assessed student's perception of parental behavior. The extent of perceived academic pressure was positively related to the extent of perceived parental Firm Control and Psychological Control.

Variables H and I.

The two questions which made up the variable termed "culture conflict" had the strongest relationship with CRPBI-R scores. Both questions were intended to focus on the immigrant respondents, and did display a relationship with years of residency in Canada ($p<.01$, $p<.001$). Respondents who felt caught in the middle between their parents "ways of doing things" and those of their peers also reported higher levels of parental Psychological Control, Rejection, and Firm

Control. The same was true for students who answered in the affirmative that their parents always asked for them to be present when they had to speak with their teachers.

One interpretation of these results is that relative newcomers to Canada felt more conflict between the values of their parents and those of their peers than did respondents born in Canada. The children of immigrants adapt more rapidly to the host culture than do their parents, and this results in a widening intergenerational gap, often manifested by open intergenerational conflict (Canadian Task Force, 1988; Rosenthal, 1984; Salvendy, 1983; Stein, 1982).

A more plausible interpretation however seems to be that the two questions tapped into respondents general dissatisfaction with parental relations, irrespective of residence in Canada. Although both questions displayed significant relationships to the residency in Canada variable, the two questions and residency in Canada were not related to the same demographic and individual variables. This weakens the interpretation that differences between the immigrant and non-immigrant groups accounted for these results.

Limitations of the Study

There are certain limitations in the multi-ethnic design of the present study which serve to delineate future directions in research.

First, in the analyses conducted for the residency in Canada variable, caution must be taken in interpreting findings of higher perceived parental Psychological Control by immigrant as opposed to non-immigrant respondents. It is difficult to determine from this design how much of the variance in CRPBI-R scale and factor scores was associated with residency in Canada and how much was associated with ethnicity, since all respondents not born in Canada were, by definition, members of another ethnic group. To clarify the relative contributions of ethnicity and years of residency in Canada, research is needed with larger samples of ethnic groups than in the present stucy, to enable comparison by varying statuses of residency in Canada.

Second, the difficulties in interpreting variables H and I in the correlational analysis have already been addressed. Research is needed with well-established instruments such as the CRPBI-R comparing immigrants and non-immigrants of the same ethnic group to assess the relationship between intergenerational relations, immigration, and ethnicity.

Third, a multi-ethnic design such as that of the present study can point out some general cross-cultural trends that can be followed up with research conducted with specific ethnic groups, but caution must be taken in interpreting even significant differences based on small group sizes. This is particularly true when only a limited amount of cross-cultural research has been performed with family measures such as the CRPBI-R, making direct comparisons with pre-existing findings impossible. Trends such as the high Acceptance factor scores on the part of the Lebanese respondents are difficult to interpret since such little research has been performed with that particular group. The same is true for the majority of the immigrant respondents in this sample. Findings such as the similarity in E. Indian respondents' CRPBI-R factor profiles to those of Schludermann and Schludermann's (1983) study are encouraging, but such validational evidence in general is rare.

The findings of this study provide support for the use of the CRPBI-R as an instrument for the cross-cultural assessment of parent-child relations. The findings also point to a need for sensitivity to cross-cultural differences in family relations, as the divergent findings in perception of parent-adolescent

relations attest. Since the composition of the sample reflected the ethnic diversity of a number of Edmonton high schools, it is hoped that teachers and guidance counsellors will obtain some useful information about how different ethnic groups view their parents and how such differences can effect their interactions with students and their families.

References

Alberta Career Development and Employment. (1989). Immigrant settlement in Alberta: 1998/89. Alberta Government Document.

Armentrout, J.A., & Burger, G.K. (1972). Factor analyses of college student's recall of parental child-rearing behaviors. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 121, 155-161.

Aronowitz, M. (1983). The social and emotional adjustment of immigrant children: A review of the literature. International Migration Review, 18(2), 237-257.

Barnes, G.E., & Vulcano, B.A. (1982). School self-acceptance among Canadian Indian, White and Metis children. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 14(1), 60-70.

Berry, J.W., Kim, U., & Boski, P. (1988). Psychological acculturation of immigrants. In Y.Y. Kim & W.B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Cross-cultural adaptation: Current approaches (pp. 62-90). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Block, V.L. (1937). Conflicts of adolescents with their mothers. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 32, 193-206.

Canadian Task Force on Mental Health Issues Affecting Immigrants and Refugees. (1988). After the door has been opened: Mental health issues affecting immigrants and refugees in Canada: Report of the Canadian Task Force on mental health issues affecting immigrants and refugees. Ottawa: Health and Welfare Canada.

Canadian Task Force on Mental Health Issues Affecting Immigrants and Refugees. (1988). Review of the literature on migrant mental health. Ottawa: Health and Welfare Canada.

Crose, E.J. (1981). Children's self-concept and perception of parent's behavior. Journal of Psychology, 108, 297-303

Culturgram. (1983). Brigham Young University Center for International and Area Studies.

Ferguson, G.A. (1989). Statistical analysis in psychology and education (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goldin, P.C. (1969). A review of children's reports of parent behaviors. Psychological Bulletin, 71(3), 222-236.

Graybill, D., & Gabel, H. (1978). Factor analysis of the children's reports of parental behavior inventory: A replication for preadolescents. Psychological Reports, 42, 953.

Ho, M.K. (1987). Family therapy with ethnic minorities. London:Sage.

Hurley, J.R. (1967). Parental acceptance-rejection and children's intelligence. In G.R. Medinnus (Ed.) Readings in the psychology of parent-child relations. New York: John Wiley.

Kawash, G.F. (1985). Self-esteem in children as a function of perceived parental behavior. Journal of Psychology, 119(3), 235-242.

Kawash, G.F., & Clewes, J.L. (1988). A factor analysis of a short form of the CRPBI: Are children's perceptions of control and discipline multidimensional? Journal of Psychology, 122(1), 57-67.

Last, U., & Klein, H. (1985). Impact of parent holocaust traumatization on offspring's reports of parental child-rearing practices. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13(4), 267-283.

Litovsky, V.G., & Dusek, J.B. (1985). Perceptions of child rearing and self-concept development during the early adolescent years. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14(5), 373-388.

Magan, Z., Weller, L., & Klahr, G. (1976). Perception of relations with parents by Yemenite annd Ashkenazi (European) adolescents. Adolescence, 11(44), 593-600.

Margolies, P.J., & Weintraub, S. (1977). The revised 56-item CRPBI as a research instrument: Reliability and factor structure. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33(2), 472-477.

Martin, B. (1975). Parent-child relations. In F.D. Horowitz (Ed.), Review of child development research: Volume 4 (pp. 463-541). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McGoldrick, M. (1982). Ethnicity and family therapy: An overview. In M. McGoldrick, J.K. Pearce, & J. Giordano (Eds.), Ethnicity and family therapy (pp. 3-31). New York: Guilford Press.

McGoldrick, M., Pearce, J.K., & Giordano, J. (1982). Ethnicity and family therapy. New York: Guilford Press.

Meijer, A. (1976). Parent evaluation by male high school students in Jerusalem. Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines, 14(2), 111-119.

Montemayor, R. (1983). Parents and adolescents in conflict: All families some of the time and some families most of the time. Journal of Early Adolescence, 3(1-2), 83-103.

Nann, R.C. (Ed.). (1982). Uprooting and surviving: Adaptation and resettlement of migrant families and children. Boston: D. Reidel.

Nuttal, E.V., & Nuttal, R.L. (1976). Parent-child relations and effective academic motivation. Journal of Psychology, 94(1), 127-133.

Prothro, E.T. (1961). Child rearing in the Lebanon. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Renson, G.J., Schaefer, E.S., & Levy, B.I. Cross-national validity of a spherical conceptual model for parent behavior. Child Development, 39, 1229-1235.

Rohner, R.P. (1975). They love me, they love me not: A worldwide study of the effects of parental acceptance and rejection. New Haven, CT: Human Relations Area Files.

Rohner, R.P. (1980). Worldwide tests of parental acceptance-rejection theory: An overview. In R.P. Rohner & E.C. Rohner (Eds.), Worldwide tests of parental acceptance-rejection theory [Special issue]. Behavior Science Research, 15, 1-23.

Rohner, R.P. (1986). The warmth dimension. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Rohner, R.P., Hahn, B.C., & Rohner, E.C. (1980). Social class differences in perceived parental acceptance-rejection and self-evaluation among Korean-American children. In R.P. Rohner & E.C. Rohner (Eds.), Worldwide tests of parental acceptance-rejection theory [Special issue]. Behavior Science Research, 15, 55-67.

Rohner, R.P, & Pattengill, S.M. (1985). Perceived parental acceptance and parental control among Korean adolescents. Child Development, 56, 524.

Rohner, R.P., & Rohner, E.C. (Eds.). (1980). Worldwide tests of parental acceptance-rejection theory [Special issue]. Behavior Science Research, 15.

Rohner, R.P., Roll, S., & Rohner, E.C. (1980). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and personality organization among Mexican and American elementary school children. In R.P. Rohner & E.C. Rohner (Eds.), Worldwide tests of parental acceptance-rejection theory [Special issue]. Behavior Science Research, 15, 23-39.

Rosenthal, D.A. (1984). Intergenerational conflict and culture: A study of immigrant and non-immigrant adolescents and their parents. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 109, 53-75.

Rowe, D.C. (1981). Environment and genetic influences on dimensions of perceived parenting: A twin study. Developmental Psychology, 17, 203.

Saavedra, J.M. (1980). Effects of perceived parental warmth and control on the self-evaluation of Puerto Rican adolescent males. In R.P. Rohner & E.C. Rohner (Eds.), Worldwide tests of parental acceptance-rejection theory [Special issue]. Behavior Science Research, 15, 41-54.

Salvendy, J.T. (1983). The mental health of immigrants: A reassessment of concepts. Canada's Mental Health, 9-12.

Schaefer, E.S. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 226-235.

Schaefer, E.S. (1965a). Children's Report of Parental Behavior: An inventory. Child Development, 36(2), 413-424.

Schaefer, E.S. (1965b). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29(6), 552-557.

Schludermann, E., & Schludermann, S. (1970a). Questionnaire for Teen-Agers and Young Adults. Unpublished manuscript.

Schludermann, E., & Schludermann, S. (1970b). Replicability of factors in Children's Report of Parent Behavior (CRPBI). Journal of Psychology, 76, 239-249.

Schludermann, S., & Schludermann, E. (1971). Adolescent perception of parent behavior (CRPBI) in Hutterite communal society. Journal of Psychology, 79, 29-39.

Schludermann, S., & Schludermann, E. (1983). Sociocultural change and adolescents' perceptions of parental behavior. Developmental Psychology, 19, 674.

Schwarz, J.C, Barton-Henry, M.L., & Pruzinsky, R. (1985). Assessing child-rearing behaviors: A comparison of ratings made by mother, father, child, and sibling on the CRPBI. Child Development, 56, 462.

Siegelman, M. (1965). Evaluation of Bronfenbrenner's questionnaire for children concerning parental behavior. Child Development, 36, 164-174.

Starkey, S.L. (1980). The relationship between parental acceptance-rejection and the academic performance of fourth and fifth graders. In R.P. Rohner & E.C. Rohner (Eds.), Worldwide tests of parental acceptance-rejection theory [Special issue]. Behavior Science Research, 15, 67-81.

Stein, B.N. (1982). The experience of being a refugee: Insights from the research literature. In C.L. Williams & J. Westermeyer (Eds.), Refugee mental health in resettlement countries (pp. 5-25). Washington: Hemisphere Publishing.

Steinberg, L. (1987). Impact of puberty on family relations: Effects of pubertal status and pubertal timing. Developmental Psychology, 23, 451.

Taylor, S. (1988). Child care practices. Manitoba Employment Services and Economic Security: Immigration and Settlement. Unpublished manuscript.

Triandis, H.C. (1980). Introduction. In H.C. Triandis & J. Draguns, (Eds.) Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 1. Perspectives. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Yip, G. (1985). Cross-cultural childrearing: An annotated bibliography. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

APPENDIX A

CRPBI-R Scale Loadings on Factors Based on Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970b, 1971) Data.

Table A-1

Varimax Rotated Matrix of CRPBI-R Scale Loadings on Factors from Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970b) Data[a]

CRPBI-R Scale[c]	A/R[b]	PC/PA	FC/LC
1	.82	.34	.06
2	.84	.13	.04
3	.69	.36	.07
4	.48	.73	.06
5	.09	.56	.56
6	.10	.45	.59
7	.86	.24	.04
8	.39	.53	.33
9	.18	.76	.11
10	.13	.84	.22
11	.18	.67	.30
12	.09	.15	.79
13	.68	.44	.08
14	.24	.11	.77
15	.16	.79	.17
16	.59	.63	.13
17	.21	.71	.09
18	.05	.13	.74

[a]Factor loadings calculated by taking mean factor loadings, irrespective of sign, of Schludermann and Schludermann's (1970b) eight groups.
[b]CRPBI-R Factors: A/R = Acceptance vs. Rejection, PC/PA = Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy, FC/LC = Firm Control vs. Lax Control.
[c]CRPBI-R Scales: 1. Acceptance, 2. Childcenteredness, 3. Possessiveness, 4. Rejection, 5. Control, 6. Enforcement, 7. Positive Involvement, 8. Intrusiveness, 9. Control through Guilt, 10. Hostile Control, 11. Inconsistent Discipline, 12. Nonenforcement, 13. Acceptance of Individuation, 14. Lax Discipline, 15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety, 16. Hostile Detachment, 17. Withdrawal of Relations, 18. Extreme Autonomy.

Table A-2

Varimax Rotated Matrix of CRPBI-R Scale Loadings on Factors from Schludermann and Schludermann's (1971) Data

CRPBI-R Scale[b]	A/R[a]	PC/PA	FC/LC
1	.83	.16	-.20
2	.85	.17	-.03
3	.56	.50	.15
4	-.18	.33	.79
5	.31	.72	-.15
6	.06	.64	.23
7	.85	.24	-.08
8	.32	.66	.13
9	.30	.70	.10
10	.19	.75	.29
11	-.04	.43	.67
12	-.08	.11	.76
13	.69	.02	.05
14	.48	.07	.62
15	-.09	.74	.19
16	-.26	.31	.77
17	-.05	.53	.54
18	.28	-.21	.71

[a]CRPBI-R Factors: A/R = Acceptance vs. Rejection, PC/PA = Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy, FC/LC = Firm Control vs. Lax Control.
[b]CRPBI-R Scales: 1. Acceptance, 2. Childcenteredness, 3. Possessiveness, 4. Rejection, 5. Control, 6. Enforcement, 7. Positive Involvement, 8. Intrusiveness, 9. Control through Guilt, 10. Hostile Control, 11. Inconsistent Discipline, 12. Nonenforcement, 13. Acceptance of Individuation, 14. Lax Discipline, 15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety, 16. Hostile Detachment, 17. Withdrawal of Relations, 18. Extreme Autonomy.

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire Parts One Thru Three

QUESTIONNAIRE PART ONE

Please follow these instructions closely in completing your answer sheets. Use the left-hand portion of Side 1 your answer sheet for Part One. Print your responses to those questions that have spaces marked, and then shade in the appropriate circle underneath. Make heavy black marks that fill the circle completely, and erase cleanly any answer you wish to change (see "Important Directions for Marking Answers" on Side 2 of your answer sheets).

Please do not fill your name in anywhere on the answer sheet, as we wish your responses to be completely confidential.

A. NAME - Do not write your name in this space! Instead, answer the following question:
What country were your parents born in?
(Print your response and shade in the proper circle under each letter of your parent's country. If mother and father were born in different countries, print and shade mother's country first, followed by father's country.)

B. SEX
(Shade in "M" if male and "F" if female.)

C. GRADE or EDUCATION
What grade are you in?
(Shade in the proper circle.)

D. BIRTH DATE
(Shade in the proper circle for month, print your responses to DAY and YR. and shade in the correct circles underneath.)

E. IDENTIFICATION NUMBER A-B
How many years of education does your mother have?
(Print your response in columns A and B, and then shade in the appropriate circle underneath. Include all her years of education, from elementary school to university, if applicable. If your mother has less than 10 years of education, write a "0" in column A and write the number of years of her education, from 0 to 9, in column B.)

F. IDENTIFICATION NUMBER C-D
How many years of education does your father have?
(Print your response in columns C and D, and then shade in the appropriate circle underneath. Include all his years of education, from elementary school to university, if applicable. If your father has less than 10 years of education, write a "0" in column C and write the number of years of his education, from 0 to 9, in column D.)

G. SPECIAL CODES K-L

How many years have you yourself lived in Canada?
(Print your response in columns K and L, and then shade in the appropriate circle underneath. If you have lived in Canada for less than 10 years, write a "0" in column K and write the number of years, from 0 to 9 years in Canada in column L.)

QUESTIONNAIRE PART TWO

Please follow these instructions closely in completing your answer sheets. Use the right-hand portion of Side 1 of your answer sheet for Part Two, starting at number 1 on the answer sheet. Shade in the appropriate circle marked A, B, C, D, or E that matches most closely your response to each question.

1. Who lives in your home with you?

A	B	C	D
both parents	mother only	father only	neither mother or father

2. How far would you like to go in school?

A	B	C	D	E
Grade 11	Grade 12	Technical or Trade School	College	University

3. How would you rate your average academic performance based on the last report?

A	B	C	D	E
below 40%	40-53%	54-67%	68-81%	above 81%

4. I seem to be caught in the middle between my parent's old-style ways of doing things and the different ways that they teach us in school and most of the other kids seem to have.

A	B	C	D	E
agree strongly	agree somewhat	neutral	disagree somewhat	disagree strongly

5. Who was/is the main disciplinarian in your home?

A	B	C	D	E
father	mother	both mother and father	other relative	other person

6. How much pressure do you get from your parents to do well in school?

A	B	C	D	E
almost none	very little	some	quite a bit	a great deal

7. How many course have you failed since you began school in September of last year (1988)?

A	B	C	D	E
none	1 or 2	3 or 4	more than 4	all

8. Whenever they have to talk to one of my teachers, my parents always ask for me or one of my brothers or sisters to be there.

A	B	C	D	E
agree strongly	agree somewhat	neutral	disagree somewhat	disagree strongly

QUESTIONNAIRE PART THREE

Instructions

Please read these instructions before turning the page.

As children grow up to be teen-agers and young adults, they learn more and more about their parents and how their parents are bringing up (or brought up) the sons and daughters. We have found that sons and daughters can well describe some of their experiences in their parental families. We would like you to describe some of these different experiences. Please read each statement on the following pages and circle the answer that most closely describes the way your parents act towards you. Be sure to mark each answer and be sure that you are starting on question number 11 of your answer sheet.

If you think the statement is LIKE your parents, shade in circle A.

If you think the statement is SOMEWHAT LIKE your parents, shade in circle B.

If you think the statement is NOT LIKE your parents, shade in circle C.

Please turn the page and go on to Part Three.

		Like	Some-what Like	Not Like
11.	Make me feel better after talking over my worries with them.	A	B	C
12.	Aren't very patient with me.	A	B	C
13.	See to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do.	A	B	C
14.	Want to know exactly where I am and what I am doing.	A	B	C
15.	Soon forget a rule they have made.	A	B	C
16.	Are easy with me.	A	B	C
17.	Don't talk with me very much.	A	B	C
18.	Will not talk to me when I displease them.	A	B	C
19.	Are very strict with me.	A	B	C
20.	Feel hurt when I don't follow advice.	A	B	C
21.	Are always telling me how I should behave.	A	B	C
22.	Usually don't find out about my misbehavior.	A	B	C
23.	Spend very little time with me.	A	B	C
24.	Almost always speak to me with a warm and friendly voice.	A	B	C
25.	Are always thinking of things that will please me.	A	B	C
26.	Believe in having a lot of rules and sticking to them.	A	B	C
27.	Tell me how much they love me.	A	B	C
28.	Are always checking on what I've been doing at school or at play.	A	B	C
29.	Punish me for doing something one day, but ignore it the next.	A	B	C

		Like	Some-what Like	Not Like
30.	Allow me to tell them if I think my ideas are better than theirs.	A	B	C
31.	Let me off easy when I do something wrong.	A	B	C
32.	Sometimes when they disapprove, don't say anything but are cold and distant for awhile.	A	B	C
33.	Forget to help me when I need it.	A	B	C
34.	Stick to a rule instead of allowing a lot of exceptions.	A	B	C
35.	Tell me exactly how to do my work.	A	B	C
36.	Don't pay much attention to my misbehavior.	A	B	C
37.	Like me to choose my own way of doing things.	A	B	C
38.	If I break a promise, don't trust me again for a long time.	A	B	C
39.	Don't seem to think of me very often.	A	B	C
40.	Don't tell me what time to be home when I go out.	A	B	C
41.	Give me a lot of care and attention.	A	B	C
42.	Believe that all my bad behavior should be punished in some way.	A	B	C
43.	Ask me to tell everything that happens when I'm away from home.	A	B	C
44.	Don't forget very quickly the things I do wrong.	A	B	C
45.	Want me to tell them about it if I don't like the way they treat me.	A	B	C
46.	Worry about me when I'm away.	A	B	C
47.	Give hard punishments.	A	B	C
48.	Believe in showing their love for me.	A	B	C
49.	Feel hurt by the things I do.	A	B	C

		Like	Some-what Like	Not Like
50.	Let me help to decide how to do things we're working on.	A	B	C
51.	Say some day I'll be punished for my bad behavior.	A	B	C
52.	Give me as much freedom as I want.	A	B	C
53.	Smile at me very often.	A	B	C
54.	Are always getting after me.	A	B	C
55.	Keep a careful check on me to make sure I have the right kind of friends.	A	B	C
56.	Depends upon their mood whether a rule is enforced or not.	A	B	C
57.	Excuse my bad conduct.	A	B	C
58.	Don't show that they love me.	A	B	C
59.	Are less friendly with me if I don't see things their way.	A	B	C
60.	Are able to make me feel better when I am upset.	A	B	C
61.	Become very involved in my life.	A	B	C
62.	Almost always complain about what I do.	A	B	C
63.	Always listen to my ideas and opinions.	A	B	C
64.	Would like to be able to tell me what to do all the time.	A	B	C
65.	Don't check up to see whether I have done what they told me.	A	B	C
66.	Think and talk about my misbehavior long after its over.	A	B	C
67.	Don't share many activities with me.	A	B	C
68.	Let me go any place I please without asking.	A	B	C
69.	Enjoy doing things with me.	A	B	C

		Like	Some-what Like	Not Like
70.	Make me feel like the most important person in their life.	A	B	C
71.	Get cross and angry about little things I do.	A	B	C
72.	Only keep rules when it suits them.	A	B	C
73.	Really want me to tell them just how I feel about things.	A	B	C
74.	Will avoid looking at me when I've disappointed them.	A	B	C
75.	Usually make me the center of attention at home.	A	B	C
76.	Often praise me.	A	B	C
77.	Says if I loved them, I'd do what they want me to do.	A	B	C
78.	Seldom insist that I do anything.	A	B	C
79.	Try to understand how I see things.	A	B	C
80.	Complain that I get on their nerves.	A	B	C
81.	Don't work with me.	A	B	C
82.	Insist that I must do exactly as I'm told.	A	B	C
83.	Ask other people what I do away from home.	A	B	C
84.	Lose their temper with me when I don't help around the house.	A	B	C
85.	Do not insist I obey if I complain or protest.	A	B	C
86.	Cheer me up when I am sad.	A	B	C
87.	See to it that I obey when they tell me something.	A	B	C
88.	Tell me of all the things they have done for me.	A	B	C
89.	Want to control whatever I do.	A	B	C
90.	Do not bother to enforce rules.	A	B	C

	Like	Some-what Like	Not Like
91. Think that any misbehavior is very serious and will have future consequences.	A	B	C
92. Are always finding fault with me.	A	B	C
93. Often speak of the good things I do.	A	B	C
94. Make their whole life center about their children.	A	B	C
95. Don't seem to know what I need or want.	A	B	C
96. Are happy to see me when I come home from school or play.	A	B	C
97. Give me the choice of what to do whenever possible.	A	B	C
98. If I've hurt their feelings, stop talking to me until I please them again.	A	B	C
99. Worry that I can't take care of myself unless they are around.	A	B	C
100. Hugged or kissed me goodnight when I was small.	A	B	C
101. Say if I really cared for them, I would not do things that cause them to worry.	A	B	C
102. Are always trying to change me.	A	B	C
103. Are easy to talk to.	A	B	C
104. Wish I were a different kind of person.	A	B	C
105. Let me go out any evening I want.	A	B	C
106. Seem proud of the things I do.	A	B	C
107. Spend almost all of their free time with their children.	A	B	C
108. I have certain jobs to do and am not allowed to do anything else until they are done.	A	B	C
109. Are very interested in what I am learning at school.	A	B	C

	Like	Some-what Like	Not Like
110. Don't like the way I act at home.	A	B	C
111. Change their minds to make things easier for themselves.	A	B	C
112. Can be talked into things easily.	A	B	C
113. Wish I would stay at home where they could take care of me.	A	B	C
114. Make me feel I'm not loved.	A	B	C
115. Have more rules than I can remember, so are often punishing me.	A	B	C
116. Say I make them happy.	A	B	C
117. Will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do.	A	B	C
118. Let me do anything I like to do.	A	B	C